UT/Texas Tribune Statewide Poll May 2011 Crosstabs

Political Interest	5-9
How Closely Following Texas Legislative Session	9-14
Approval Ratings:	
Obama Approval	14-20
U.S. Congress Approval	20-25
Perry Approval	25-30
Legislature Approval	30-36
Mood of Texans:	
Country Right Track/Wrong Direction	36-40
Texas Right Track/Wrong Direction	40-44
National Economy Retrospection	44-49
Texas Economy Prospection	50-53
Family Economy Retrospection	53-59
Horse Races:	
Choice of Party Primary	59-63
GOP Senate Primary	63-69
GOP Presidential Primary	69-79
Democratic Senate Primary	79-84
U.S. President General Election – Obama vs Generic Republican	84-88
U.S. Senate General Election – Generic Democrat vs Generic Republican	89-92
Congress Generic Ballot with Tea Party	93-97

Miscellaneous Policy Issues:	
Texas Government as a Model	97-102
Sonogram Bill	102-107
Same-Sex Marriage	107-112
State Revenue for Education	112-117
Redistricting	117-121
Budget Battery:	
General Preference – Spending Cuts Versus Revenue Increases (Recoded)	121-124
Spending Cuts Items –	
Cut State's Share of Primary and Secondary Education Funding	125-128
Cut State's Share of Higher Education Funding	129-131
End Funding for Pre-Kindergarten	131-135
Reduce Grants For College Students	135-138
Reduce State Contributions to Retirement Programs	138-141
End Funding for Children's Health Insurance	141-145
End State Environmental Regulation	145-148
Cut Payments to Medicaid Providers	148-151
Cut State Funding for Nursing Home Care	151-155
Close Prisons for Adults	155-158
Close Prisons for Juveniles	158-161
Reduce Funding for Highway Construction	161-165
Reduce Funding for Border Security	165-168
Revenue Increases Items –	
Legalize and Tax Gambling	168-171
Increase Taxes on Alcoholic Beverages	171-175
Legalize and Tax Marijuana	175-178

Adopt a Fuel Inefficiency Surcharge	178-181
Ban and Fine Talking on Cell Phones While Driving	181-185
Eliminate State Sales Tax Holiday	185-188
Increase State Tax on Businesses	188-191
Increase Sales Tax Rate	191-195
Implement State Income Tax	195-198
Respondent Does Not Support Any Revenue Increase	198-202
Rainy Day Fund	202-206
Immigration Battery:	
Citizenship for Military Service	206-211
Citizenship for Attending College	211-216
Comprehensive Immigration Overhaul	216-221
Local Enforcement of Federal Immigration Laws	221-227
Immigration Good/Bad Thing for U.S.	227-231
Race and Representation Battery	
Importance of Representative's Race/Ethnicity	231-235
Strength of Agreement: My Member of Congress Represents People Like Me	235-240
Importance of Living in District with People Like You	240-244
Strength of Agreement: People of My Race Share Similar Preferences	244-250
Importance that More People of Your Race are Elected to Legislature/Congress	250-254
Likelihood of Contacting Representative	254-259

[This page intentionally left blank]

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	26	27	31	68	50	102	96	400
		% within libcon	57.8%	47.4%	53.4%	29.6%	44.6%	61.8%	76.2%	50.4%
	Somewhat interested	Count	11	28	21	110	54	58	26	308
		% within libcon	24.4%	49.1%	36.2%	47.8%	48.2%	35.2%	20.6%	38.8%
	Not very interested	Count	4	2	5	33	3	5	2	54
		% within libcon	8.9%	3.5%	8.6%	14.3%	2.7%	3.0%	1.6%	6.8%
	Not at all interested	Count	4	0	1	18	3	0	2	28
		% within libcon	8.9%	.0%	1.7%	7.8%	2.7%	.0%	1.6%	3.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	45	57	58	230	112	165	126	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * libcon Crosstabulation

Political interest * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	68	23	32	45	84	23	119	5	399
		% within 7 point Party ID	41.0%	28.7%	62.7%	48.4%	67.2%	34.8%	61.0%	38.5%	50.6%
	Somewhat interested	Count	81	37	15	31	36	35	67	4	306
Ν		% within 7 point Party ID	48.8%	46.3%	29.4%	33.3%	28.8%	53.0%	34.4%	30.8%	38.8%
	Not very interested	Count	5	15	4	7	4	8	9	1	53
		% within 7 point Party ID	3.0%	18.8%	7.8%	7.5%	3.2%	12.1%	4.6%	7.7%	6.7%
	Not at all interested	Count	10	5	0	10	0	0	0	3	28
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.0%	6.3%	.0%	10.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	23.1%	3.5%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	166	80	51	93	125	66	195	13	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			Ī				
				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	40	91	188	81	400
		% within age	30.5%	42.3%	57.5%	65.3%	50.2%
	Somewhat interested	Count	55	99	120	35	309
		% within age	42.0%	46.0%	36.7%	28.2%	38.8%
	Not very interested	Count	25	18	8	7	58
		% within age	19.1%	8.4%	2.4%	5.6%	7.3%
	Not at all interested	Count	10	7	9	1	27
		% within age	7.6%	3.3%	2.8%	.8%	3.4%
	Don't know	Count	1	0	2	0	3
		% within age	.8%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	131	215	327	124	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * age Crosstabulation

Political interest * Education Crosstabulation

					Education)			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	15	114	130	47	59	36	401
		% within Education	45.5%	38.0%	54.2%	61.0%	56.2%	81.8%	50.2%
	Somewhat interested	Count	12	140	87	25	39	8	311
		% within Education	36.4%	46.7%	36.3%	32.5%	37.1%	18.2%	38.9%
	Not very interested	Count	3	29	13	4	7	0	56
		% within Education	9.1%	9.7%	5.4%	5.2%	6.7%	.0%	7.0%
	Not at all interested	Count	3	15	9	1	0	0	28
		% within Education	9.1%	5.0%	3.8%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	3.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
		% within Education	.0%	.7%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	33	300	240	77	105	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

0	
Religious attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	70	67	44	109	110	400
		% within Religious attendance	51.5%	52.8%	50.0%	50.5%	47.8%	50.2%
	Somewhat interested	Count	58	45	36	85	85	309
		% within Religious attendance	42.6%	35.4%	40.9%	39.4%	37.0%	38.8%
	Not very interested	Count	3	9	7	12	25	56
	Not very interested Co % att	% within Religious attendance	2.2%	7.1%	8.0%	5.6%	10.9%	7.0%
	Not at all interested	Count	3	6	1	10	9	29
		% within Religious attendance	2.2%	4.7%	1.1%	4.6%	3.9%	3.6%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	0	0	1	3
		% within Religious attendance	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.4%
Total		Count	136	127	88	216	230	797
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Plance	Plack	Hisponia	Acion	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³	Mixed	Other	Total
Delitient internet	Estas a chainte a chail	Onumb		Diack	Tilspariic	Asian	Tativo	IVIIXEU	Other	10121
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	277	36	54	3	5	10	15	400
		% within Race	55.0%	37.5%	37.5%	33.3%	100.0%	66.7%	65.2%	50.3%
	Somewhat interested	Count	186	41	68	1	0	5	8	309
		% within Race	36.9%	42.7%	47.2%	11.1%	.0%	33.3%	34.8%	38.8%
	Not very interested	Count	29	8	15	4	0	0	0	56
		% within Race	5.8%	8.3%	10.4%	44.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.0%
	Not at all interested	Count	9	10	7	1	0	0	0	27
		% within Race	1.8%	10.4%	4.9%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.4%
	Don't know	Count	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Race	.6%	1.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%

Total	Count	504	96	144	9	5	15	23	796
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				0.0.00					
					Marit	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	257	6	54	16	53	16	402
		% within Marital Status	56.1%	46.2%	55.7%	45.7%	34.4%	39.0%	50.4%
	Somewhat interested	Count	172	5	37	14	65	16	309
		% within Marital Status	37.6%	38.5%	38.1%	40.0%	42.2%	39.0%	38.7%
	Not very interested	Count	22	1	5	4	17	8	57
		% within Marital Status	4.8%	7.7%	5.2%	11.4%	11.0%	19.5%	7.1%
	Not at all interested	Count	5	1	1	1	18	1	27
		% within Marital Status	1.1%	7.7%	1.0%	2.9%	11.7%	2.4%	3.4%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
		% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.4%
Total		Count	458	13	97	35	154	41	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Political interest * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	231	170	401
		% within Gender	62.4%	39.8%	50.3%
	Somewhat interested	Count	120	188	308
		% within Gender	32.4%	44.0%	38.6%
	Not very interested	Count	12	45	57
		% within Gender	3.2%	10.5%	7.2%
	Not at all interested	Count	7	21	28
		% within Gender	1.9%	4.9%	3.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	3	3
		% within Gender	.0%	.7%	.4%
Total		Count	370	427	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	110	200	90	400
		% within urban/suburban/rural	51.4%	51.4%	47.9%	50.6%
	Somewhat interested	Count	82	148	78	308
		% within urban/suburban/rural	38.3%	38.0%	41.5%	38.9%
	Not very interested	Count	13	26	13	52
		% within urban/suburban/rural	6.1%	6.7%	6.9%	6.6%
	Not at all interested	Count	7	15	6	28
		% within urban/suburban/rural	3.3%	3.9%	3.2%	3.5%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	1	3
		% within urban/suburban/rural	.9%	.0%	.5%	.4%
Total		Count	214	389	188	791
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Political interest * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Political interest * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Political interest	Extremely interested	Count	89	112	30	45	123	399
		% within metro area	57.8%	47.3%	47.6%	65.2%	46.2%	50.6%
	Somewhat interested	Count	56	102	19	21	106	304
		% within metro area	36.4%	43.0%	30.2%	30.4%	39.8%	38.5%
	Not very interested	Count	8	15	11	3	19	56
		% within metro area	5.2%	6.3%	17.5%	4.3%	7.1%	7.1%
	Not at all interested	Count	1	7	3	0	16	27
		% within metro area	.6%	3.0%	4.8%	.0%	6.0%	3.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	0	0	2	3
		% within metro area	.0%	.4%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.4%
Total		Count	154	237	63	69	266	789
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	11	4	8	17	12	24	25	101
session		% within libcon	24.4%	7.0%	14.0%	7.4%	10.8%	14.5%	20.0%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	17	26	23	78	44	93	69	350
		% within libcon	37.8%	45.6%	40.4%	33.8%	39.6%	56.4%	55.2%	44.2%
	Not that closely	Count	9	19	19	77	41	45	29	239
		% within libcon	20.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	36.9%	27.3%	23.2%	30.2%
	Not at all	Count	8	8	7	59	14	3	2	101
		% within libcon	17.8%	14.0%	12.3%	25.5%	12.6%	1.8%	1.6%	12.8%
Total		Count	45	57	57	231	111	165	125	791
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * libcon Crosstabulation

Following Texas legislative session * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	15	6	8	14	23	11	22	2	101
session		% within 7 point Party ID	8.9%	7.4%	15.7%	15.2%	18.5%	16.9%	11.3%	16.7%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	69	20	27	36	54	23	114	3	346
		% within 7 point Party ID	41.1%	24.7%	52.9%	39.1%	43.5%	35.4%	58.8%	25.0%	44.0%
N	Not that closely	Count	55	34	13	26	38	18	52	4	240
		% within 7 point Party ID	32.7%	42.0%	25.5%	28.3%	30.6%	27.7%	26.8%	33.3%	30.5%
	Not at all	Count	29	21	3	16	7	13	6	3	98
		% within 7 point Party ID	17.3%	25.9%	5.9%	17.4%	5.6%	20.0%	3.1%	25.0%	12.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Total		Count	168	81	51	92	124	65	194	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	13	28	45	16	102
session		% within age	10.0%	12.8%	13.7%	12.9%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	38	91	164	59	352
		% within age	29.2%	41.7%	50.0%	47.6%	44.0%
	Not that closely	Count	35	67	97	41	240

		% within age	26.9%	30.7%	29.6%	33.1%	30.0%
	Not at all	Count	44	32	20	8	104
		% within age	33.8%	14.7%	6.1%	6.5%	13.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	2	0	2
		% within age	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.3%
Total		Count	130	218	328	124	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	۱			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Following Texas	Extremely closely	Count	1	19	34	15	16	15	100
legislative session		% within Education	3.0%	6.3%	14.2%	19.5%	15.0%	34.1%	12.5%
	Somewhat closely	Count	12	123	110	35	54	19	353
		% within Education	36.4%	41.0%	46.0%	45.5%	50.5%	43.2%	44.1%
	Not that closely	Count	12	97	72	24	28	8	241
		% within Education	36.4%	32.3%	30.1%	31.2%	26.2%	18.2%	30.1%
	Not at all	Count	8	59	23	3	9	2	104
		% within Education	24.2%	19.7%	9.6%	3.9%	8.4%	4.5%	13.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
		% within Education	.0%	.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Total		Count	33	300	239	77	107	44	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas	legislative session	* Religious attendance	Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	18	21	11	26	26	102
session		% within Religious attendance	13.0%	16.7%	12.4%	12.0%	11.3%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	67	60	45	90	90	352
		% within Religious attendance	48.6%	47.6%	50.6%	41.7%	39.0%	44.0%
	Not that closely	Count	46	26	21	77	69	239

		% within Religious attendance	33.3%	20.6%	23.6%	35.6%	29.9%	29.9%
	Not at all	Count	7	19	10	23	46	105
		% within Religious attendance	5.1%	15.1%	11.2%	10.6%	19.9%	13.1%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	2	0	0	2
		% within Religious attendance	.0%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Total		Count	138	126	89	216	231	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	71	7	9	1	3	4	7	102
session		% within Race	14.0%	7.2%	6.3%	10.0%	60.0%	26.7%	29.2%	12.7%
	Somewhat closely	Count	246	30	58	3	2	5	9	353
		% within Race	48.5%	30.9%	40.3%	30.0%	40.0%	33.3%	37.5%	44.0%
	Not that closely	Count	148	41	42	0	0	4	5	240
		% within Race	29.2%	42.3%	29.2%	.0%	.0%	26.7%	20.8%	29.9%
	Not at all	Count	42	19	33	6	0	2	3	105
		% within Race	8.3%	19.6%	22.9%	60.0%	.0%	13.3%	12.5%	13.1%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
		% within Race	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.2%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	15	24	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
								Domestic	
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Following Texas	Extremely closely	Count	70	2	7	4	9	10	102
legislative session		% within Marital Status	15.3%	15.4%	7.3%	11.4%	5.7%	25.0%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	225	4	50	12	52	10	353

		% within Marital Status	49.1%	30.8%	52.1%	34.3%	33.1%	25.0%	44.2%
	Not that closely	Count	124	7	33	14	49	11	238
		% within Marital Status	27.1%	53.8%	34.4%	40.0%	31.2%	27.5%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	37	0	6	5	47	9	104
		% within Marital Status	8.1%	.0%	6.3%	14.3%	29.9%	22.5%	13.0%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
		% within Marital Status	.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Total		Count	458	13	96	35	157	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	60	42	102
session		% within Gender	16.1%	9.8%	12.7%
	Somewhat closely	Count	184	169	353
		% within Gender	49.3%	39.5%	44.1%
	Not that closely	Count	104	135	239
		% within Gender	27.9%	31.5%	29.8%
	Not at all	Count	23	82	105
		% within Gender	6.2%	19.2%	13.1%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	2
		% within Gender	.5%	.0%	.2%
Total		Count	373	428	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	Iral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	27	51	24	102
session		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.6%	13.0%	12.6%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely Not that closely	Count	87	177	88	352
		% within urban/suburban/rural	40.7%	45.3%	46.3%	44.3%
		Count	77	113	49	239
		% within urban/suburban/rural	36.0%	28.9%	25.8%	30.1%

	Not at all	Count	21	50	29	100
		% within urban/suburban/rural	9.8%	12.8%	15.3%	12.6%
	Don't know	Count	2	0	0	2
		% within urban/suburban/rural	.9%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Total		Count	214	391	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Following Texas legislative session * metro area Crosstabulation

-					metro area			
				Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	
			Yes, I live in the	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Following Texas legislative	Extremely closely	Count	21	38	7	11	25	102
session		% within metro area	13.5%	15.8%	10.9%	15.7%	9.3%	12.8%
	Somewhat closely	Count	82	100	31	34	106	353
		% within metro area	52.6%	41.7%	48.4%	48.6%	39.6%	44.2%
	Not that closely	Count	45	67	13	20	91	236
		% within metro area	28.8%	27.9%	20.3%	28.6%	34.0%	29.6%
	Not at all	Count	8	35	13	5	44	105
		% within metro area	5.1%	14.6%	20.3%	7.1%	16.4%	13.2%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	0	2	2
		% within metro area	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.3%
Total		Count	156	240	64	70	268	798
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential approval * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely	2	0	In the middle (F	6	Extremely	Total
		_	liberali	2	3	In the middle4	Э	0	conservative/	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	20	31	27	67	12	1	1	159
		% within libcon	44.4%	55.4%	45.8%	29.0%	10.7%	.6%	.8%	20.1%
A	Approve somewhat	Count	8	18	20	54	7	9	2	118
	% within libco	% within libcon	17.8%	32.1%	33.9%	23.4%	6.3%	5.5%	1.6%	14.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	10	1	3	42	9	2	3	70
	disapprove	% within libcon	22.2%	1.8%	5.1%	18.2%	8.0%	1.2%	2.4%	8.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	3	5	3	20	23	11	1	66
		% within libcon	6.7%	8.9%	5.1%	8.7%	20.5%	6.7%	.8%	8.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	4	1	5	41	61	141	118	371

	_	% within libcon	8.9%	1.8%	8.5%	17.7%	54.5%	86.0%	94.4%	46.8%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	8
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	1.7%	3.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	45	56	59	231	112	164	125	792
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	105	20	19	10	0	0	2	0	156
		% within 7 point Party ID	62.5%	25.0%	36.5%	10.9%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	19.7%
	Approve somewhat	Count	42	29	20	15	0	7	3	2	118
		% within 7 point Party ID	25.0%	36.3%	38.5%	16.3%	.0%	10.6%	1.5%	15.4%	14.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	10	13	5	24	4	6	5	4	71
	disapprove	% within 7 point Party ID	6.0%	16.3%	9.6%	26.1%	3.2%	9.1%	2.6%	30.8%	9.0%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	3	5	6	11	15	17	12	0	69
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	6.3%	11.5%	12.0%	12.0%	25.8%	6.2%	.0%	8.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	4	11	2	31	106	35	173	6	368
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	13.8%	3.8%	33.7%	84.8%	53.0%	88.7%	46.2%	46.5%
	Don't know	Count	4	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	9
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	2.5%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	7.7%	1.1%
Total		Count	168	80	52	92	125	66	195	13	791
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Pres	idential approval * ag	e Crosstabula	tion			
-				ag	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	36	38	68	17	159
		% within age	27.3%	17.6%	20.8%	13.6%	19.9%
	Approve somewhat	Count	16	33	54	16	119
		% within age	12.1%	15.3%	16.5%	12.8%	14.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	27	22	19	4	72
	disapprove	% within age	20.5%	10.2%	5.8%	3.2%	9.0%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	26	21	5	71
		% within age	14.4%	12.0%	6.4%	4.0%	8.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	29	97	162	83	371
		% within age	22.0%	44.9%	49.5%	66.4%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	5	0	3	0	8
		% within age	3.8%	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	132	216	327	125	800

Presidential approval * age Crosstabulation

				а	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	36	38	68	17	159
		% within age	27.3%	17.6%	20.8%	13.6%	19.9%
	Approve somewhat	Count	16	33	54	16	119
		% within age	12.1%	15.3%	16.5%	12.8%	14.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	27	22	19	4	72
	disapprove	% within age	20.5%	10.2%	5.8%	3.2%	9.0%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	26	21	5	71
		% within age	14.4%	12.0%	6.4%	4.0%	8.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	29	97	162	83	371
		% within age	22.0%	44.9%	49.5%	66.4%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	5	0	3	0	8
		% within age	3.8%	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	132	216	327	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential approval * age Crosstabulation

Presidential approval * Education Crosstabulation

					Education	l			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	0	56	50	15	23	15	159
		% within Education	.0%	18.6%	21.0%	19.5%	21.7%	34.9%	19.9%
	Approve somewhat	Count	4	40	34	15	23	4	120
		% within Education	12.5%	13.3%	14.3%	19.5%	21.7%	9.3%	15.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	10	34	17	2	6	1	70
	disapprove	% within Education	31.3%	11.3%	7.1%	2.6%	5.7%	2.3%	8.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	3	27	24	5	10	2	71
		% within Education	9.4%	9.0%	10.1%	6.5%	9.4%	4.7%	8.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	15	139	111	40	44	21	370
		% within Education	46.9%	46.2%	46.6%	51.9%	41.5%	48.8%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	5	2	0	0	0	7
		% within Education	.0%	1.7%	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%
Total		Count	32	301	238	77	106	43	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	22	14	16	41	66	159
		% within Religious attendance	15.9%	11.1%	17.8%	19.0%	28.6%	19.9%
	Approve somewhat	Count	8	18	14	35	44	119
		% within Religious attendance	5.8%	14.3%	15.6%	16.2%	19.0%	14.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	8	11	10	21	22	72
	disapprove	% within Religious attendance	5.8%	8.7%	11.1%	9.7%	9.5%	9.0%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	12	8	10	23	18	71
		% within Religious attendance	8.7%	6.3%	11.1%	10.6%	7.8%	8.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	87	73	39	91	81	371
		% within Religious attendance	63.0%	57.9%	43.3%	42.1%	35.1%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	1	2	1	5	0	9
		% within Religious attendance	.7%	1.6%	1.1%	2.3%	.0%	1.1%
Total		Count	138	126	90	216	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential approval * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	63	50	37	2	0	4	3	159
		% within Race	12.5%	51.0%	25.7%	22.2%	.0%	28.6%	13.6%	19.9%
	Approve somewhat	Count	68	24	25	1	0	2	0	120
		% within Race	13.5%	24.5%	17.4%	11.1%	.0%	14.3%	.0%	15.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	38	10	17	4	0	1	0	70
	disapprove	% within Race	7.5%	10.2%	11.8%	44.4%	.0%	7.1%	.0%	8.8%
Dis	Disapprove somewhat	Count	49	5	11	0	0	2	3	70
		% within Race	9.7%	5.1%	7.6%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	13.6%	8.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	287	8	47	2	5	5	16	370

	-	% within Race	56.8%	8.2%	32.6%	22.2%	100.0%	35.7%	72.7%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	8
		% within Race	.0%	1.0%	4.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	505	98	144	9	5	14	22	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		••			Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	74	3	23	8	43	9	160
		% within Marital Status	16.1%	23.1%	23.7%	22.9%	27.4%	22.5%	20.0%
	Approve somewhat	Count	59	2	24	2	24	8	119
		% within Marital Status	12.9%	15.4%	24.7%	5.7%	15.3%	20.0%	14.9%
	Neither approve nor	Count	26	1	3	3	32	6	71
disapprove	% within Marital Status	5.7%	7.7%	3.1%	8.6%	20.4%	15.0%	8.9%	
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	43	2	6	2	16	2	71
		% within Marital Status	9.4%	15.4%	6.2%	5.7%	10.2%	5.0%	8.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	253	5	41	20	38	15	372
		% within Marital Status	55.1%	38.5%	42.3%	57.1%	24.2%	37.5%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	4	0	0	0	4	0	8
		% within Marital Status	.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	157	40	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Presidential approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	der	
			Male	Female	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	76	83	159
		% within Gender	20.3%	19.4%	19.9%
	Approve somewhat	Count	42	78	120
		% within Gender	11.2%	18.3%	15.0%
	Neither approve nor	Count	21	50	71
	disapprove	% within Gender	5.6%	11.7%	8.9%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	32	39	71
		% within Gender	8.6%	9.1%	8.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	202	170	372

		% within Gender	54.0%	39.8%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	1	7	8
		% within Gender	.3%	1.6%	1.0%
Total		Count	374	427	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

urban/suburban/rural Urban Suburban Rural Total Presidential approval 15 159 Count 49 95 Approve strongly 22.8% 24.4% 7.9% % within urban/suburban/rural 20.0% Approve somewhat Count 39 60 21 120 % within urban/suburban/rural 18.1% 11.1% 15.4% 15.1% Neither approve nor 27 67 Count 22 18 disapprove % within urban/suburban/rural 10.2% 6.9% 9.5% 8.4% Disapprove somewhat Count 21 31 19 71 % within urban/suburban/rural 9.8% 7.9% 10.0% 8.9% Disapprove strongly Count 79 175 116 370 36.7% 44.9% % within urban/suburban/rural 61.1% 46.5% Don't know 2 Count 5 8 1 % within urban/suburban/rural 2.3% .5% 1.0% .5% Total Count 215 390 190 795 % within urban/suburban/rural 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Presidential approval * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Presidential approval * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			Í
			Yes, I live in the	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort	Yes, I live in the San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	No, I live in another part of	
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Presidential approval	Approve strongly	Count	37	60	8	20	34	159
		% within metro area	23.9%	25.1%	12.7%	29.0%	12.8%	20.1%
1	Approve somewhat	Count	21	42	13	16	27	119
1		% within metro area	13.5%	17.6%	20.6%	23.2%	10.2%	15.0%
1	Neither approve nor	Count	9	21	8	1	30	69
	disapprove	% within metro area	5.8%	8.8%	12.7%	1.4%	11.3%	8.7%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	16	19	5	2	28	70
1		% within metro area	10.3%	7.9%	7.9%	2.9%	10.5%	8.8%

	Disapprove strongly	Count	68	95	29	28	147	367
		% within metro area	43.9%	39.7%	46.0%	40.6%	55.3%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	4	2	0	2	0	8
		% within metro area	2.6%	.8%	.0%	2.9%	.0%	1.0%
Total		Count	155	239	63	69	266	792
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

_						libcon				-
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	1	0	1	4	0	0	3	9
		% within libcon	2.1%	.0%	1.7%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	2.4%	1.1%
	Approve somewhat	Count	14	9	12	32	6	25	20	118
		% within libcon	29.8%	15.8%	20.7%	13.8%	5.4%	15.2%	16.1%	14.8%
	Neither approve nor	Count	7	12	4	73	31	15	12	154
	disapprove	% within libcon	14.9%	21.1%	6.9%	31.5%	27.7%	9.1%	9.7%	19.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	9	15	16	46	38	59	32	215
		% within libcon	19.1%	26.3%	27.6%	19.8%	33.9%	35.8%	25.8%	27.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	16	17	23	65	36	66	55	278
		% within libcon	34.0%	29.8%	39.7%	28.0%	32.1%	40.0%	44.4%	35.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	4	2	12	1	0	2	21
		% within libcon	.0%	7.0%	3.4%	5.2%	.9%	.0%	1.6%	2.6%
Total		Count	47	57	58	232	112	165	124	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * libcon Crosstabulation

Congress approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	3	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	9
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	2.5%	2.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.5%	.0%	1.1%
	Approve somewhat	Count	44	11	3	3	16	8	29	0	114
		% within 7 point Party ID	26.3%	13.8%	5.9%	3.2%	12.9%	12.3%	14.9%	.0%	14.5%
Neither approve nor	Count	35	18	12	25	16	11	30	5	152	
	disapprove % within 7 point	% within 7 point Party ID	21.0%	22.5%	23.5%	26.9%	12.9%	16.9%	15.4%	45.5%	19.3%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	33	25	17	14	36	24	62	1	212
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.8%	31.3%	33.3%	15.1%	29.0%	36.9%	31.8%	9.1%	27.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	39	21	18	50	54	20	70	5	277
		% within 7 point Party ID	23.4%	26.3%	35.3%	53.8%	43.5%	30.8%	35.9%	45.5%	35.2%
	Don't know	Count	13	3	0	1	0	2	3	0	22
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.8%	3.8%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	3.1%	1.5%	.0%	2.8%

Total	Count	167	80	51	93	124	65	195	11	786
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		nigress approval ag					
				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	3	3	4	0	10
		% within age	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	.0%	1.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	17	46	39	15	117
		% within age	13.1%	21.2%	11.9%	12.1%	14.6%
	Neither approve nor	Count	41	51	46	17	155
	disapprove	% within age	31.5%	23.5%	14.0%	13.7%	19.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	65	99	32	215
		% within age	14.6%	30.0%	30.2%	25.8%	26.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	36	50	138	54	278
		% within age	27.7%	23.0%	42.1%	43.5%	34.8%
	Don't know	Count	14	2	2	6	24
		% within age	10.8%	.9%	.6%	4.8%	3.0%
Total		Count	130	217	328	124	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * age Crosstabulation

Congress approval * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	0	4	3	2	1	0	10
		% within Education	.0%	1.3%	1.2%	2.6%	1.0%	.0%	1.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	3	50	32	14	10	8	117
		% within Education	9.4%	16.6%	13.3%	18.2%	9.5%	18.6%	14.6%
	Neither approve nor Count		6	76	46	6	20	2	156
	disapprove	% within Education	18.8%	25.2%	19.1%	7.8%	19.0%	4.7%	19.5%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	8	73	70	18	37	9	215
		% within Education	25.0%	24.3%	29.0%	23.4%	35.2%	20.9%	26.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	14	86	81	37	36	24	278
		% within Education	43.8%	28.6%	33.6%	48.1%	34.3%	55.8%	34.8%
	Don't know	Count	1	12	9	0	1	0	23
		% within Education	3.1%	4.0%	3.7%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	2.9%

Total	Count	32	301	241	77	105	43	799
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	3	3	2	1	2	11
		% within Religious attendance	2.2%	2.4%	2.2%	.5%	.9%	1.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	18	16	19	31	33	117
		% within Religious attendance	13.1%	12.7%	21.3%	14.2%	14.3%	14.6%
	Neither approve nor	Count	26	24	17	54	34	155
	disapprove	% within Religious attendance	19.0%	19.0%	19.1%	24.8%	14.7%	19.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	44	33	15	64	59	215
		% within Religious attendance	32.1%	26.2%	16.9%	29.4%	25.5%	26.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	46	46	36	59	92	279
		% within Religious attendance	33.6%	36.5%	40.4%	27.1%	39.8%	34.8%
	Don't know	Count	0	4	0	9	11	24
		% within Religious attendance	.0%	3.2%	.0%	4.1%	4.8%	3.0%
Total		Count	137	126	89	218	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Congress approval * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	10
Congress approval	Applove stroligly	Count	(')	2	0		0	0	U	10
		% within Race	.2%	2.0%	4.2%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%
	Approve somewhat	Count	56	18	35	1	0	3	5	118
		% within Race	11.1%	18.4%	24.3%	10.0%	.0%	20.0%	20.8%	14.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	100	27	20	7	0	0	1	155

	disapprove	% within Race	19.8%	27.6%	13.9%	70.0%	.0%	.0%	4.2%	19.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	146	21	36	0	1	5	6	215
		% within Race	28.9%	21.4%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	26.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	195	25	36	1	3	7	12	279
		% within Race	38.5%	25.5%	25.0%	10.0%	75.0%	46.7%	50.0%	34.8%
	Don't know	Count	8	5	11	0	0	0	0	24
		% within Race	1.6%	5.1%	7.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.0%
Total		Count	506	98	144	10	4	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	7	0	0	0	4	0	11
		% within Marital Status	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.6%	.0%	1.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	69	2	15	3	21	8	118
		% within Marital Status	15.1%	16.7%	15.6%	8.6%	13.5%	20.5%	14.8%
	Neither approve nor	Count	81	2	13	3	48	7	154
	disapprove	% within Marital Status	17.7%	16.7%	13.5%	8.6%	31.0%	17.9%	19.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	132	4	32	8	27	9	212
		% within Marital Status	28.8%	33.3%	33.3%	22.9%	17.4%	23.1%	26.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	158	4	36	18	48	14	278
		% within Marital Status	34.5%	33.3%	37.5%	51.4%	31.0%	35.9%	35.0%
	Don't know	Count	11	0	0	3	7	1	22
		% within Marital Status	2.4%	.0%	.0%	8.6%	4.5%	2.6%	2.8%
Total		Count	458	12	96	35	155	39	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval ³	' Gender	Crosstabulation	
--------------------------------	----------	-----------------	--

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	5	6	11
		% within Gender	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%
	Approve somewhat	Count	45	73	118
		% within Gender	12.1%	17.0%	14.7%

	Neither approve nor	Count	49	107	156
	disapprove	% within Gender	13.1%	24.9%	19.5%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	102	113	215
		% within Gender	27.3%	26.3%	26.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	167	112	279
		% within Gender	44.8%	26.1%	34.8%
	Don't know	Count	5	18	23
		% within Gender	1.3%	4.2%	2.9%
Total		Count	373	429	802
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	5	4	0	9
		% within urban/suburban/rural	2.3%	1.0%	.0%	1.1%
	Approve somewhat	Count	37	60	20	117
	Approve somewnat Count % within urban/suburba		17.4%	15.4%	10.5%	14.8%
	Neither approve nor	Count	39	76	36	151
	disapprove	18.3%	19.5%	18.9%	19.1%	
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	58	100	57	215
		% within urban/suburban/rural	27.2%	25.7%	30.0%	27.1%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	65	141	71	277
		% within urban/suburban/rural	30.5%	36.2%	37.4%	35.0%
	Don't know	Count	9	8	6	23
		% within urban/suburban/rural	4.2%	2.1%	3.2%	2.9%
Total		Count	213	389	190	792
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Congress approval * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
				Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	
			Yes, I live in the	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Congress approval	Approve strongly	Count	2	2	0	1	6	11
		% within metro area	1.3%	.8%	.0%	1.4%	2.2%	1.4%

	Approve somewhat	Count	25	43	15	5	29	117
		% within metro area	16.1%	17.9%	23.4%	7.0%	10.9%	14.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	24	51	10	9	57	151
	disapprove	% within metro area	15.5%	21.3%	15.6%	12.7%	21.3%	18.9%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	37	54	17	29	78	215
		% within metro area	23.9%	22.5%	26.6%	40.8%	29.2%	27.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	62	78	18	25	96	279
		% within metro area	40.0%	32.5%	28.1%	35.2%	36.0%	35.0%
	Don't know	Count	5	12	4	2	1	24
		% within metro area	3.2%	5.0%	6.3%	2.8%	.4%	3.0%
Total		Count	155	240	64	71	267	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon			r	1 '
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	4	0	0	10	12	29	40	95
		% within libcon	8.7%	.0%	.0%	4.3%	10.8%	17.6%	32.0%	12.0%
	Approve somewhat	Count	2	1	7	40	38	82	58	228
		% within libcon	4.3%	1.8%	11.9%	17.3%	34.2%	49.7%	46.4%	28.8%
	Neither approve nor	Count	5	5	3	52	24	19	11	119
(disapprove	% within libcon	10.9%	8.9%	5.1%	22.5%	21.6%	11.5%	8.8%	15.0%
1	Disapprove somewhat	Count	1	9	13	37	11	24	12	107
1		% within libcon	2.2%	16.1%	22.0%	16.0%	9.9%	14.5%	9.6%	13.5%
1	Disapprove strongly	Count	34	41	35	78	22	9	4	223
1		% within libcon	73.9%	73.2%	59.3%	33.8%	19.8%	5.5%	3.2%	28.1%
1	Don't know	Count	0	0	1	14	4	2	0	21
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	1.7%	6.1%	3.6%	1.2%	.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	46	56	59	231	111	165	125	793
1		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	irty ID				
	Strong Not very strong Lean Not very strong Democrat Democrat Lean Democrat Independent Republican Republican						Strong Republican	Not sure	Total		
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	7	3	0	3	24	6	54	0	97
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.2%	3.8%	.0%	3.3%	19.2%	9.1%	27.7%	.0%	12.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	11	8	7	16	60	24	95	2	223
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.6%	10.0%	14.0%	17.4%	48.0%	36.4%	48.7%	16.7%	28.3%
	Neither approve nor	Count	Count 15 15 4 28 18 11 21 4							4	116

	disapprove	% within 7 point Party ID	9.0%	18.8%	8.0%	30.4%	14.4%	16.7%	10.8%	33.3%	14.7%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	24	12	4	17	18	14	17	1	107
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.4%	15.0%	8.0%	18.5%	14.4%	21.2%	8.7%	8.3%	13.6%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	101	38	35	26	5	8	5	5	223
		% within 7 point Party ID	60.5%	47.5%	70.0%	28.3%	4.0%	12.1%	2.6%	41.7%	28.3%
	Don't know	Count	9	4	0	2	0	3	3	0	21
		% within 7 point Party ID	5.4%	5.0%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	4.5%	1.5%	.0%	2.7%
Total		Count	167	80	50	92	125	66	195	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	6	23	44	25	98
		% within age	4.6%	10.6%	13.4%	20.0%	12.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	37	64	87	42	230
		% within age	28.5%	29.5%	26.5%	33.6%	28.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	19	45	37	18	119
	disapprove	% within age	14.6%	20.7%	11.3%	14.4%	14.9%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	20	26	47	16	109
	Disapprove somewhat	% within age	15.4%	12.0%	14.3%	12.8%	13.6%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	36	55	109	23	223
		% within age	27.7%	25.3%	33.2%	18.4%	27.9%
	Don't know	Count	12	4	4	1	21
		% within age	9.2%	1.8%	1.2%	.8%	2.6%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	۱			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	5	42	26	12	9	4	98
		% within Education	15.6%	14.0%	10.9%	15.6%	8.5%	9.1%	12.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	14	91	67	24	23	10	229
		% within Education	43.8%	30.3%	28.0%	31.2%	21.7%	22.7%	28.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	4	58	37	7	9	3	118
	disapprove	% within Education	12.5%	19.3%	15.5%	9.1%	8.5%	6.8%	14.8%

	Disapprove somewhat	Count	1	47	28	7	18	8	109
		% within Education	3.1%	15.7%	11.7%	9.1%	17.0%	18.2%	13.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	5	54	76	25	43	19	222
		% within Education	15.6%	18.0%	31.8%	32.5%	40.6%	43.2%	27.8%
	Don't know	Count	3	8	5	2	4	0	22
		% within Education	9.4%	2.7%	2.1%	2.6%	3.8%	.0%	2.8%
Total		Count	32	300	239	77	106	44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	23	22	12	21	19	97
		% within Religious attendance	16.7%	17.6%	13.8%	9.7%	8.2%	12.2%
	Approve somewhat	Count	46	41	21	68	51	227
		% within Religious attendance	33.3%	32.8%	24.1%	31.5%	22.1%	28.5%
	Neither approve nor	Count	23	18	15	27	35	118
	disapprove	% within Religious attendance	16.7%	14.4%	17.2%	12.5%	15.2%	14.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	20	15	10	33	31	109
		% within Religious attendance	14.5%	12.0%	11.5%	15.3%	13.4%	13.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	23	25	27	58	90	223
		% within Religious attendance	16.7%	20.0%	31.0%	26.9%	39.0%	28.0%
	Don't know	Count	3	4	2	9	5	23
		% within Religious attendance	2.2%	3.2%	2.3%	4.2%	2.2%	2.9%
Total		Count	138	125	87	216	231	797
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * Race Crosstabulation

Race	Total
	1

							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	65	1	24	2	0	2	5	99
		% within Race	12.8%	1.0%	16.7%	20.0%	.0%	13.3%	21.7%	12.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	164	16	32	2	4	3	7	228
		% within Race	32.3%	16.3%	22.2%	20.0%	80.0%	20.0%	30.4%	28.4%
	Neither approve nor	Count	68	18	26	4	0	1	1	118
	disapprove	% within Race	13.4%	18.4%	18.1%	40.0%	.0%	6.7%	4.3%	14.7%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	71	14	17	0	1	3	5	111
		% within Race	14.0%	14.3%	11.8%	.0%	20.0%	20.0%	21.7%	13.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	127	45	40	1	0	6	5	224
		% within Race	25.0%	45.9%	27.8%	10.0%	.0%	40.0%	21.7%	27.9%
	Don't know	Count	12	4	5	1	0	0	0	22
		% within Race	2.4%	4.1%	3.5%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.7%
Total		Count	507	98	144	10	5	15	23	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	66	1	13	6	10	1	97
		% within Marital Status	14.3%	8.3%	13.5%	17.6%	6.4%	2.5%	12.2%
	Approve somewhat	Count	134	7	24	11	34	19	229
		% within Marital Status	29.1%	58.3%	25.0%	32.4%	21.8%	47.5%	28.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	68	0	9	2	36	3	118
d	disapprove	% within Marital Status	14.8%	.0%	9.4%	5.9%	23.1%	7.5%	14.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	76	2	8	6	15	2	109
	Disappiove somewhat	% within Marital Status	16.5%	16.7%	8.3%	17.6%	9.6%	5.0%	13.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	105	2	41	8	53	15	224
		% within Marital Status	22.8%	16.7%	42.7%	23.5%	34.0%	37.5%	28.1%
	Don't know	Count	11	0	1	1	8	0	21
		% within Marital Status	2.4%	.0%	1.0%	2.9%	5.1%	.0%	2.6%
Total		Count	460	12	96	34	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	eerenner appiv		anen		
			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	46	52	98
		% within Gender	12.3%	12.1%	12.2%
	Approve somewhat	Count	125	104	229
		% within Gender	33.5%	24.3%	28.6%
	Neither approve nor	Count	51	68	119
	disapprove	% within Gender	13.7%	15.9%	14.9%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	44	66	110
		% within Gender	11.8%	15.4%	13.7%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	104	119	223
		% within Gender	27.9%	27.8%	27.8%
	Don't know	Count	3	19	22
		% within Gender	.8%	4.4%	2.7%
Total		Count	373	428	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * Gender Crosstabulation

Governor approval * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	31	37	30	98
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.4%	9.5%	15.9%	12.3%
	Approve somewhat	Count	52	115	61	228
		% within urban/suburban/rural	24.2%	29.5%	32.3%	28.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	26	60	28	114
	disapprove	% within urban/suburban/rural	12.1%	15.4%	14.8%	14.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	23	54	33	110
		% within urban/suburban/rural	10.7%	13.8%	17.5%	13.9%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	77	115	31	223
		% within urban/suburban/rural	35.8%	29.5%	16.4%	28.1%
	Don't know	Count	6	9	6	21
		% within urban/suburban/rural	2.8%	2.3%	3.2%	2.6%
Total		Count	215	390	189	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort	Yes, I live in the San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	No, I live in another part of	Tatal
0	-	0	Houston area.	vvortn area	area	Austin area	Texas.	I otal
Governor approval	Approve strongly	Count	18	17	10	2	50	97
		% within metro area	11.5%	7.1%	15.9%	2.9%	18.7%	12.2%
	Approve somewhat	Count	37	72	13	19	88	229
		% within metro area	23.7%	30.1%	20.6%	27.1%	32.8%	28.8%
	Neither approve nor	Count	20	29	16	5	45	115
	disapprove	% within metro area	12.8%	12.1%	25.4%	7.1%	16.8%	14.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	26	35	9	11	29	110
		% within metro area	16.7%	14.6%	14.3%	15.7%	10.8%	13.8%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	50	80	15	30	48	223
		% within metro area	32.1%	33.5%	23.8%	42.9%	17.9%	28.0%
	Don't know	Count	5	6	0	3	8	22
		% within metro area	3.2%	2.5%	.0%	4.3%	3.0%	2.8%
Total		Count	156	239	63	70	268	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Governor approval * metro area Crosstabulation

Texas legislature job approval * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	1	0	0	1	10	17	22	51
approval		% within libcon	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.4%	9.0%	10.4%	17.6%	6.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	3	3	7	40	33	77	59	222
		% within libcon	6.5%	5.3%	12.1%	17.5%	29.7%	47.0%	47.2%	28.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	6	7	5	64	37	36	19	174
	disapprove	% within libcon	13.0%	12.3%	8.6%	28.1%	33.3%	22.0%	15.2%	22.1%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	8	13	17	51	14	22	17	142
		% within libcon	17.4%	22.8%	29.3%	22.4%	12.6%	13.4%	13.6%	18.0%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	28	27	26	50	13	9	5	158
		% within libcon	60.9%	47.4%	44.8%	21.9%	11.7%	5.5%	4.0%	20.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	7	3	22	4	3	3	42
		% within libcon	.0%	12.3%	5.2%	9.6%	3.6%	1.8%	2.4%	5.3%
Total		Count	46	57	58	228	111	164	125	789
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	2	0	0	3	15	6	26	0	52
approval		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	12.2%	9.1%	13.3%	.0%	6.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	21	9	7	19	53	17	91	1	218
		% within 7 point Party ID	12.6%	11.3%	13.5%	20.7%	43.1%	25.8%	46.7%	8.3%	27.7%
	Neither approve nor	Count	38	17	8	19	23	20	41	6	172
	disapprove	% within 7 point Party ID	22.8%	21.3%	15.4%	20.7%	18.7%	30.3%	21.0%	50.0%	21.9%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	31	22	9	25	22	11	23	0	143
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.6%	27.5%	17.3%	27.2%	17.9%	16.7%	11.8%	.0%	18.2%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	59	21	26	23	9	10	7	5	160
		% within 7 point Party ID	35.3%	26.3%	50.0%	25.0%	7.3%	15.2%	3.6%	41.7%	20.3%
	Don't know	Count	16	11	2	3	1	2	7	0	42
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.6%	13.8%	3.8%	3.3%	.8%	3.0%	3.6%	.0%	5.3%
Total		Count	167	80	52	92	123	66	195	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Texas legislature job approval * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	7	20	11	14	52
		% within age	5.4%	9.2%	3.4%	11.2%	6.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	29	55	91	49	224
		% within age	22.3%	25.2%	28.0%	39.2%	28.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	28	56	60	30	174
	disapprove	% within age	21.5%	25.7%	18.5%	24.0%	21.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	19	36	74	16	145
		% within age	14.6%	16.5%	22.8%	12.8%	18.2%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	25	42	80	13	160
		% within age	19.2%	19.3%	24.6%	10.4%	20.1%
	Don't know	Count	22	9	9	3	43
		% within age	16.9%	4.1%	2.8%	2.4%	5.4%
Total		Count	130	218	325	125	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
				High school		0	4	Deet and	Tatal
	-	-		graduate	Some college	z-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	2	20	20	4	5	2	53
approval		% within Education	6.1%	6.7%	8.3%	5.2%	4.7%	4.5%	6.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	14	89	63	22	27	9	224
		% within Education	42.4%	29.7%	26.3%	28.6%	25.2%	20.5%	28.0%
	Neither approve nor	Count	4	87	50	14	17	3	175
	disapprove	% within Education	12.1%	29.0%	20.8%	18.2%	15.9%	6.8%	21.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	6	46	41	13	25	14	145
		% within Education	18.2%	15.3%	17.1%	16.9%	23.4%	31.8%	18.1%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	4	38	52	24	29	14	161
		% within Education	12.1%	12.7%	21.7%	31.2%	27.1%	31.8%	20.1%
	Don't know	Count	3	20	14	0	4	2	43
		% within Education	9.1%	6.7%	5.8%	.0%	3.7%	4.5%	5.4%
Total		Count	33	300	240	77	107	44	801
Iotai		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

	<u> </u>			Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	12	13	7	14	7	53
approval		% within Religious attendance	8.7%	10.4%	7.9%	6.5%	3.0%	6.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	47	36	28	70	43	224
		% within Religious attendance	34.1%	28.8%	31.5%	32.4%	18.7%	28.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	34	33	13	37	57	174
	disapprove	Neither approve nor Count disapprove % within Religious attendance	24.6%	26.4%	14.6%	17.1%	24.8%	21.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	28	19	14	41	44	146
		% within Religious attendance	20.3%	15.2%	15.7%	19.0%	19.1%	18.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	14	17	19	42	67	159
		% within Religious attendance	10.1%	13.6%	21.3%	19.4%	29.1%	19.9%
	Don't know	Count	3	7	8	12	12	42
		% within Religious attendance	2.2%	5.6%	9.0%	5.6%	5.2%	5.3%
Total		Count	138	125	89	216	230	798

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	12	13	7	14	7	53
approval		% within Religious attendance	8.7%	10.4%	7.9%	6.5%	3.0%	6.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	47	36	28	70	43	224
		% within Religious attendance	34.1%	28.8%	31.5%	32.4%	18.7%	28.1%
	Neither approve nor	Count	34	33	13	37	57	174
	disapprove	% within Religious attendance	24.6%	26.4%	14.6%	17.1%	24.8%	21.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	28	19	14	41	44	146
		% within Religious attendance	20.3%	15.2%	15.7%	19.0%	19.1%	18.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	14	17	19	42	67	159
		% within Religious attendance	10.1%	13.6%	21.3%	19.4%	29.1%	19.9%
	Don't know	Count	3	7	8	12	12	42
		% within Religious attendance	2.2%	5.6%	9.0%	5.6%	5.2%	5.3%
Total		Count	138	125	89	216	230	798
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

|--|

Texas legislature job approval * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	35	4	9	1	0	0	3	52
approval		% within Race	6.9%	4.1%	6.3%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	6.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	147	23	37	0	4	6	7	224
		% within Race	29.1%	23.7%	25.9%	.0%	80.0%	42.9%	29.2%	28.0%
	Neither approve nor	Count	115	26	26	6	0	0	1	174
	disapprove	% within Race	22.7%	26.8%	18.2%	60.0%	.0%	.0%	4.2%	21.8%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	90	13	26	2	1	4	10	146
		% within Race	17.8%	13.4%	18.2%	20.0%	20.0%	28.6%	41.7%	18.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	99	19	35	0	0	4	3	160

		% within Race	19.6%	19.6%	24.5%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	12.5%	20.0%
	Don't know	Count	20	12	10	1	0	0	0	43
		% within Race	4.0%	12.4%	7.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5.4%
Total		Count	506	97	143	10	5	14	24	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Mari	tal Status			I
								Domestic	I
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	39	0	2	2	7	3	53
approval		% within Marital Status	8.5%	.0%	2.1%	5.7%	4.5%	7.3%	6.6%
	Approve somewhat	Count	137	8	26	11	30	12	224
		% within Marital Status	29.8%	61.5%	26.8%	31.4%	19.2%	29.3%	28.0%
	Neither approve nor	Count	86	1	26	11	40	10	174
	disapprove % within Marital	% within Marital Status	18.7%	7.7%	26.8%	31.4%	25.6%	24.4%	21.7%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	87	3	14	5	29	7	145
		% within Marital Status	19.0%	23.1%	14.4%	14.3%	18.6%	17.1%	18.1%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	84	1	25	3	41	7	161
		% within Marital Status	18.3%	7.7%	25.8%	8.6%	26.3%	17.1%	20.1%
	Don't know	Count	26	0	4	3	9	2	44
		% within Marital Status	5.7%	.0%	4.1%	8.6%	5.8%	4.9%	5.5%
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	156	41	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Texas legislature job approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gen	lder	
			Male	Female	Total
Texas legislature job approval	Approve strongly	Count	32	20	52
		% within Gender	8.6%	4.7%	6.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	111	113	224
		% within Gender	29.8%	26.6%	28.1%
	Neither approve nor disapprove	Count	66	107	173
		% within Gender	17.7%	25.2%	21.7%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	71	75	146
		% within Gender	19.0%	17.6%	18.3%
	Disapprove strongly	Count	84	76	160

		% within Gender	22.5%	17.9%	20.1%
	Don't know	Count	9	34	43
		% within Gender	2.4%	8.0%	5.4%
Total		Count	373	425	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

urban/suburban/rural Urban Suburban Rural Total Texas legislature job approval Approve strongly Count 11 52 17 24 % within urban/suburban/rural 7.9% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 223 Approve somewhat Count 54 101 68 25.1% 26.0% % within urban/suburban/rural 35.8% 28.1% Neither approve nor 93 174 Count 37 44 disapprove % within urban/suburban/rural 17.2% 24.0% 23.2% 21.9% Disapprove somewhat 70 Count 39 36 145 % within urban/suburban/rural 18.1% 18.0% 18.9% 18.3% Disapprove strongly Count 58 82 21 161 27.0% % within urban/suburban/rural 21.1% 11.1% 20.3% Don't know 10 Count 10 18 38 % within urban/suburban/rural 4.7% 4.8% 4.6% 5.3% Total Count 215 388 190 793 100.0% % within urban/suburban/rural 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Texas legislature job approval * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Texas legislature job approval * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			í '
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Texas legislature job	Approve strongly	Count	13	16	0	1	22	52
Approval Approve s Neither ap disapprove		% within metro area	8.3%	6.7%	.0%	1.4%	8.3%	6.5%
	Approve somewhat	Count	40	59	20	16	89	224
		% within metro area	25.6%	24.7%	31.7%	22.5%	33.6%	28.2%
	Neither approve nor	Count	28	55	17	12	58	170
	disapprove	% within metro area	17.9%	23.0%	27.0%	16.9%	21.9%	21.4%
	Disapprove somewhat	Count	37	30	17	15	45	144
		% within metro area	23.7%	12.6%	27.0%	21.1%	17.0%	18.1%

	Disapprove strongly	Count	30	63	9	21	38	161
		% within metro area	19.2%	26.4%	14.3%	29.6%	14.3%	20.3%
	Don't know	Count	8	16	0	6	13	43
		% within metro area	5.1%	6.7%	.0%	8.5%	4.9%	5.4%
Total		Count	156	239	63	71	265	794
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	18	33	25	89	17	3	3	188
		% within libcon	39.1%	57.9%	43.1%	38.5%	15.2%	1.8%	2.4%	23.7%
	Wrong track	Count	17	12	25	99	77	148	119	497
		% within libcon	37.0%	21.1%	43.1%	42.9%	68.8%	90.2%	94.4%	62.6%
	Don't know	Count	11	12	8	43	18	13	4	109
		% within libcon	23.9%	21.1%	13.8%	18.6%	16.1%	7.9%	3.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	101	27	22	10	5	10	6	1	182
		% within 7 point Party ID	60.1%	33.8%	43.1%	10.9%	4.0%	14.9%	3.1%	7.7%	23.0%
	Wrong track	Count	34	34	18	64	114	49	177	8	498
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.2%	42.5%	35.3%	69.6%	91.2%	73.1%	90.8%	61.5%	63.0%
	Don't know	Count	33	19	11	18	6	8	12	4	111
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.6%	23.8%	21.6%	19.6%	4.8%	11.9%	6.2%	30.8%	14.0%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	67	195	13	791
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * age Crosstabulation

	а	ge					
18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total			
Country direction	Right direction	Count	33	59	73	23	188
-------------------	-----------------	--------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
		% within age	25.4%	27.2%	22.2%	18.4%	23.5%
	Wrong track	Count	62	137	215	89	503
		% within age	47.7%	63.1%	65.3%	71.2%	62.8%
	Don't know	Count	35	21	41	13	110
		% within age	26.9%	9.7%	12.5%	10.4%	13.7%
Total		Count	130	217	329	125	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
				High school					T ()
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	lotal
Country direction	Right direction	Count	3	73	52	19	26	16	189
		% within Education	9.4%	24.3%	21.8%	24.7%	24.5%	36.4%	23.7%
	Wrong track	Count	24	175	151	52	73	27	502
		% within Education	75.0%	58.1%	63.2%	67.5%	68.9%	61.4%	62.8%
	Don't know	Count	5	53	36	6	7	1	108
		% within Education	15.6%	17.6%	15.1%	7.8%	6.6%	2.3%	13.5%
Total		Count	32	301	239	77	106	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	22	21	25	44	76	188
		% within Religious attendance	15.9%	16.7%	28.4%	20.4%	32.9%	23.5%
	Wrong track	Count	103	92	54	136	117	502
		% within Religious attendance	74.6%	73.0%	61.4%	63.0%	50.6%	62.8%
	Don't know	Count	13	13	9	36	38	109
		% within Religious attendance	9.4%	10.3%	10.2%	16.7%	16.5%	13.6%
Total		_ Count	138	126	88	216	231	799

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once	0	A few times a	Once or twice a	Name	Tatal
			а week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Iotal
Country direction	Right direction	Count	22	21	25	44	76	188
		% within Religious attendance	15.9%	16.7%	28.4%	20.4%	32.9%	23.5%
	Wrong track	Count	103	92	54	136	117	502
		% within Religious attendance	74.6%	73.0%	61.4%	63.0%	50.6%	62.8%
	Don't know	Count	13	13	9	36	38	109
		% within Religious attendance	9.4%	10.3%	10.2%	16.7%	16.5%	13.6%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Country direction * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	79	47	54	5	0	0	3	188
		% within Race	15.6%	48.5%	37.5%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	23.5%
	Wrong track	Count	366	27	67	5	5	13	20	503
		% within Race	72.3%	27.8%	46.5%	50.0%	100.0%	92.9%	83.3%	62.9%
	Don't know	Count	61	23	23	0	0	1	1	109
		% within Race	12.1%	23.7%	16.0%	.0%	.0%	7.1%	4.2%	13.6%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	14	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Marital Status						
					Domestic	
Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total

Country direction	Right direction Count		83	4	27	8	52	14	188
		% within Marital Status	18.1%	30.8%	28.1%	22.9%	33.1%	35.0%	23.5%
	Wrong track	Count	318	9	54	26	74	22	503
		% within Marital Status	69.3%	69.2%	56.3%	74.3%	47.1%	55.0%	62.9%
	Don't know	Count	58	0	15	1	31	4	109
		% within Marital Status	12.6%	.0%	15.6%	2.9%	19.7%	10.0%	13.6%
Total		Count	459	13	96	35	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	79	109	188
		% within Gender	21.2%	25.5%	23.5%
	Wrong track	Count	253	249	502
		% within Gender	67.8%	58.3%	62.7%
	Don't know	Count	41	69	110
		% within Gender	11.0%	16.2%	13.8%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	61	107	20	188
	% within urban/suburban/rura		28.5%	27.4%	10.5%	23.7%
	Wrong track Count			235	145	501
		% within urban/suburban/rural	56.5%	60.3%	76.3%	63.1%
	Don't know	Count	32	48	25	105
		% within urban/suburban/rural	15.0%	12.3%	13.2%	13.2%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Country direction * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Country direction	Right direction	Count	41	61	18	24	45	189
		% within metro area	26.5%	25.4%	28.6%	34.3%	16.9%	23.8%
	Wrong track	Count	96	149	39	34	180	498
		% within metro area	61.9%	62.1%	61.9%	48.6%	67.4%	62.6%
	Don't know	Count	18	30	6	12	42	108
		% within metro area	11.6%	12.5%	9.5%	17.1%	15.7%	13.6%
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	5	6	4	51	43	97	79	285
i		% within libcon	10.9%	10.7%	6.8%	22.1%	38.7%	58.8%	63.2%	35.9%
i	Wrong track	Count	35	40	51	131	43	40	29	369
		% within libcon	76.1%	71.4%	86.4%	56.7%	38.7%	24.2%	23.2%	46.5%
	Don't know	Count	6	10	4	49	25	28	17	139
		% within libcon	13.0%	17.9%	6.8%	21.2%	22.5%	17.0%	13.6%	17.5%
Total		Count	46	56	59	231	111	165	125	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	24	14	6	21	74	27	113	2	281
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.4%	17.5%	11.8%	22.8%	59.2%	40.9%	57.9%	16.7%	35.7%
	Wrong track	Count	112	50	41	49	34	25	50	6	367
		% within 7 point Party ID	67.1%	62.5%	80.4%	53.3%	27.2%	37.9%	25.6%	50.0%	46.6%
	Don't know	Count	31	16	4	22	17	14	32	4	140
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.6%	20.0%	7.8%	23.9%	13.6%	21.2%	16.4%	33.3%	17.8%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	125	66	195	12	788

7 point Party ID Not very Not very Strong strong Lean Lean strong Strong Democrat Democrat Democrat Independent Republican Republican Republican Not sure Total Right direction Texas direction Count 24 14 6 21 74 27 113 2 281 59.2% 40.9% 57.9% % within 7 point Party ID 14.4% 17.5% 11.8% 22.8% 16.7% 35.7% Wrong track Count 112 41 34 25 50 367 50 49 6 % within 7 point Party ID 67.1% 62.5% 80.4% 53.3% 27.2% 37.9% 25.6% 50.0% 46.6% Don't know Count 31 16 22 17 14 32 140 4 4 16.4% 17.8% % within 7 point Party ID 18.6% 20.0% 7.8% 23.9% 13.6% 21.2% 33.3% Total Count 51 66 195 788 167 80 92 125 12 100.0% % within 7 point Party ID 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Texas direction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Texas direction * age Crosstabulation

				а	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	32	85	108	63	288
		% within age	24.6%	39.0%	32.9%	50.4%	36.0%
	Wrong track	Count	62	102	164	43	371
		% within age	47.7%	46.8%	50.0%	34.4%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	36	31	56	19	142
		% within age	27.7%	14.2%	17.1%	15.2%	17.7%
Total		Count	130	218	328	125	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	10	114	82	30	37	14	287
		% within Education	31.3%	37.9%	34.3%	39.0%	35.2%	31.8%	36.0%
	Wrong track	Count	12	118	112	42	59	27	370
		% within Education	37.5%	39.2%	46.9%	54.5%	56.2%	61.4%	46.4%
	Don't know	Count	10	69	45	5	9	3	141
		% within Education	31.3%	22.9%	18.8%	6.5%	8.6%	6.8%	17.7%
Total		Count	32	301	239	77	105	44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Reli	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	60	50	34	77	68	289
		% within Religious attendance	43.5%	39.7%	38.6%	35.6%	29.4%	36.2%
	Wrong track	Count	52	56	38	98	125	369
		% within Religious attendance	37.7%	44.4%	43.2%	45.4%	54.1%	46.2%
	Don't know	Count	26	20	16	41	38	141
		% within Religious attendance	18.8%	15.9%	18.2%	19.0%	16.5%	17.6%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Texas direction * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	199	18	52	4	4	3	8	288
		% within Race	39.3%	18.6%	36.1%	44.4%	80.0%	20.0%	34.8%	36.0%
	Wrong track	Count	219	57	67	3	1	10	13	370
		% within Race	43.2%	58.8%	46.5%	33.3%	20.0%	66.7%	56.5%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	89	22	25	2	0	2	2	142
		% within Race	17.6%	22.7%	17.4%	22.2%	.0%	13.3%	8.7%	17.8%
Total		Count	507	97	144	9	5	15	23	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	188	9	22	13	36	21	289
		% within Marital Status	41.0%	69.2%	22.7%	37.1%	22.9%	52.5%	36.1%
	Wrong track	Count	187	3	60	18	88	15	371
		% within Marital Status	40.7%	23.1%	61.9%	51.4%	56.1%	37.5%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	84	1	15	4	33	4	141
		% within Marital Status	18.3%	7.7%	15.5%	11.4%	21.0%	10.0%	17.6%
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	157	40	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	164	125	289
		% within Gender	44.0%	29.3%	36.1%
	Wrong track	Count	161	209	370
		% within Gender	43.2%	48.9%	46.3%
	Don't know	Count	48	93	141
		% within Gender	12.9%	21.8%	17.6%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Tex	as direction * urban/suburban/ru	Iral Crosstab	ulation		
			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	74	141	73	288
		% within urban/suburban/rural	34.6%	36.2%	38.4%	36.3%
	Wrong track	Count	101	187	82	370
		% within urban/suburban/rural	47.2%	47.9%	43.2%	46.6%
	Don't know	Count	39	62	35	136
		% within urban/suburban/rural	18.2%	15.9%	18.4%	17.1%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

. . .

		·			metro area			
				Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	
			Yes, I live in the	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Texas direction	Right direction	Count	56	82	22	19	109	288
		% within metro area	35.9%	34.3%	34.9%	27.1%	40.8%	36.2%
	Wrong track	Count	80	119	30	40	96	365
		% within metro area	51.3%	49.8%	47.6%	57.1%	36.0%	45.9%
	Don't know	Count	20	38	11	11	62	142
		% within metro area	12.8%	15.9%	17.5%	15.7%	23.2%	17.9%
Total		Count	156	239	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas direction * metro area Crosstabulation

Economy status * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	2	0	3	9	0	1	1	16
		% within libcon	4.3%	.0%	5.1%	3.9%	.0%	.6%	.8%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	16	27	26	58	16	8	5	156
		% within libcon	34.8%	48.2%	44.1%	25.2%	14.2%	4.9%	4.0%	19.6%
	About the same	Count	19	14	14	65	38	34	17	201
		% within libcon	41.3%	25.0%	23.7%	28.3%	33.6%	20.7%	13.5%	25.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	7	6	10	45	32	55	37	192
		% within libcon	15.2%	10.7%	16.9%	19.6%	28.3%	33.5%	29.4%	24.2%
	A lot worse off	Count	2	3	5	38	26	65	64	203
		% within libcon	4.3%	5.4%	8.5%	16.5%	23.0%	39.6%	50.8%	25.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	6	1	15	1	1	2	26
		% within libcon	.0%	10.7%	1.7%	6.5%	.9%	.6%	1.6%	3.3%
Total		Count	46	56	59	230	113	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID	Total
		·

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Economy status	A lot better off	Count % within 7 point Party ID	11 6.5%	3 3.8%	0 .0%	1 1.1%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 .5%	0 .0%	16 2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count % within 7 point Party ID	69 41.1%	23 29.1%	30 60.0%	11 12.1%	8 6.4%	7 10.6%	9 4.6%	0 .0%	157 19.9%
	About the same	Count % within 7 point Party ID	43 25.6%	22 27.8%	12 24.0%	31 34.1%	22 17.6%	20 30.3%	42 21.3%	3 25.0%	195 24.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count % within 7 point Party ID	29 17.3%	16 20.3%	2 4.0%	19 20.9%	45 36.0%	19 28.8%	61 31.0%	2 16.7%	193 24.5%
	A lot worse off	Count % within 7 point Party ID	5 3.0%	9 11.4%	6 12.0%	28 30.8%	48 38.4%	19 28.8%	82 41.6%	4 33.3%	201 25.5%
	Don't know	Count % within 7 point Party ID	11 6.5%	6 7.6%	0 .0%	1 1.1%	2 1.6%	1 1.5%	2 1.0%	3 25.0%	26 3.3%
Total		Count % within 7 point Party ID	168 100.0%	79 100.0%	50 100.0%	91 100.0%	125 100.0%	66 100.0%	197 100.0%	12 100.0%	788 100.0%

Economy status * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	3	3	8	3	17
		% within age	2.3%	1.4%	2.5%	2.4%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	27	45	66	20	158
		% within age	20.6%	20.6%	20.2%	16.1%	19.8%
	About the same	Count	44	73	68	18	203
		% within age	33.6%	33.5%	20.9%	14.5%	25.4%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	27	42	86	37	192
		% within age	20.6%	19.3%	26.4%	29.8%	24.0%
	A lot worse off	Count	15	50	92	46	203
		% within age	11.5%	22.9%	28.2%	37.1%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	15	5	6	0	26
		% within age	11.5%	2.3%	1.8%	.0%	3.3%
Total		Count	131	218	326	124	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Education				
				High school			_	_	
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	0	7	4	3	0	1	15
		% within Education	.0%	2.3%	1.7%	3.9%	.0%	2.3%	1.9%
	Somewhat better off	Count	6	52	47	14	27	12	158
		% within Education	18.2%	17.4%	19.7%	18.2%	25.5%	27.9%	19.8%
	About the same	Count	8	81	58	17	30	10	204
		% within Education	24.2%	27.1%	24.3%	22.1%	28.3%	23.3%	25.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	12	71	54	22	26	7	192
		% within Education	36.4%	23.7%	22.6%	28.6%	24.5%	16.3%	24.1%
	A lot worse off	Count	7	72	70	21	20	13	203
		% within Education	21.2%	24.1%	29.3%	27.3%	18.9%	30.2%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	16	6	0	3	0	25
		% within Education	.0%	5.4%	2.5%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	3.1%
Total		Count	33	299	239	77	106	43	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * Education Crosstabulation

Economy status * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	1	1	5	3	6	16
		% within Religious attendance	.7%	.8%	5.7%	1.4%	2.6%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	16	17	19	40	65	157
		% within Religious attendance	11.7%	13.5%	21.6%	18.6%	28.1%	19.7%
	About the same	Count	35	33	18	48	69	203
		% within Religious attendance	25.5%	26.2%	20.5%	22.3%	29.9%	25.5%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	36	36	22	62	37	193
		% within Religious attendance	26.3%	28.6%	25.0%	28.8%	16.0%	24.2%

	A lot worse off	Count	49	36	19	52	47	203
		% within Religious attendance	35.8%	28.6%	21.6%	24.2%	20.3%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	3	5	10	7	25
		% within Religious attendance	.0%	2.4%	5.7%	4.7%	3.0%	3.1%
Total		Count	137	126	88	215	231	797
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	6	Diack 5	3	1	1121100		1	16
Leonomy status		% within Race	1.2%	5.2%	2.1%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	4.2%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	77	38	39	2	0	2	1	159
		% within Race	15.2%	39.2%	26.9%	22.2%	.0%	12.5%	4.2%	19.8%
	About the same	Count	134	21	39	3	0	4	3	204
		% within Race	26.5%	21.6%	26.9%	33.3%	.0%	25.0%	12.5%	25.4%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	126	24	31	3	1	3	5	193
		% within Race	24.9%	24.7%	21.4%	33.3%	20.0%	18.8%	20.8%	24.1%
	A lot worse off	Count	153	3	24	0	4	6	14	204
		% within Race	30.2%	3.1%	16.6%	.0%	80.0%	37.5%	58.3%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	10	6	9	0	0	1	0	26
		% within Race	2.0%	6.2%	6.2%	.0%	.0%	6.3%	.0%	3.2%
Total		Count	506	97	145	9	5	16	24	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * Marital Status Crosstabulation

		Marit	al Status			ĺ
					Domestic	
Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total

Economy status	A lot better off	Count	4	0	4	1	6	1	16
		% within Marital Status	.9%	.0%	4.2%	2.9%	3.8%	2.5%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	82	4	25	7	34	7	159
		% within Marital Status	17.8%	36.4%	26.0%	20.0%	21.5%	17.5%	19.9%
	About the same	Count	117	3	15	7	52	9	203
		% within Marital Status	25.4%	27.3%	15.6%	20.0%	32.9%	22.5%	25.4%
	Somewhat worse off	mewhat worse off Count		3	28	11	27	6	192
		% within Marital Status		27.3%	29.2%	31.4%	17.1%	15.0%	24.0%
	A lot worse off Count		126	1	24	9	27	17	204
	% within Marital Status		27.4%	9.1%	25.0%	25.7%	17.1%	42.5%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	14	0	0	0	12	0	26
		% within Marital Status	3.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.6%	.0%	3.3%
Total		Count	460	11	96	35	158	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	11	6	17
		% within Gender	2.9%	1.4%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	73	85	158
		% within Gender	19.6%	19.9%	19.8%
	About the same	Count	91	113	204
		% within Gender	24.4%	26.5%	25.5%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	87	106	193
		% within Gender	23.3%	24.8%	24.1%
	A lot worse off	Count	108	95	203
		% within Gender	29.0%	22.2%	25.4%
	Don't know	Count	3	22	25
		% within Gender	.8%	5.2%	3.1%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

		urban/suburban/rural	Total
--	--	----------------------	-------

			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	4	9	3	16
		% within urban/suburban/rural	1.9%	2.3%	1.6%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	58	79	21	158
		% within urban/suburban/rural	27.1%	20.2%	11.1%	19.9%
	About the same	Count	55	112	37	204
		% within urban/suburban/rural	25.7%	28.6%	19.6%	25.7%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	44	87	60	191
		% within urban/suburban/rural	20.6%	22.3%	31.7%	24.1%
	A lot worse off	Count	46	95	63	204
		% within urban/suburban/rural	21.5%	24.3%	33.3%	25.7%
	Don't know	Count	7	9	5	21
		% within urban/suburban/rural	3.3%	2.3%	2.6%	2.6%
Total		Count	214	391	189	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Economy status * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Economy status	A lot better off	Count	6	6	0	0	4	16
		% within metro area	3.8%	2.5%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	39	43	14	26	37	159
		% within metro area	25.0%	18.0%	23.0%	37.1%	13.9%	20.1%
	About the same	Count	38	76	11	18	56	199
		% within metro area	24.4%	31.8%	18.0%	25.7%	21.0%	25.1%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	31	60	15	12	74	192
		% within metro area	19.9%	25.1%	24.6%	17.1%	27.7%	24.2%
	A lot worse off	Count	38	47	19	13	85	202
		% within metro area	24.4%	19.7%	31.1%	18.6%	31.8%	25.5%
	Don't know	Count	4	7	2	1	11	25
		% within metro area	2.6%	2.9%	3.3%	1.4%	4.1%	3.2%
Total		Count	156	239	61	70	267	793
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	13	16	15	58	51	75	60	288
		% within libcon	28.3%	28.1%	25.4%	25.1%	45.9%	45.5%	47.6%	36.2%
	Worse	Count	24	27	37	126	47	70	50	381
		% within libcon	52.2%	47.4%	62.7%	54.5%	42.3%	42.4%	39.7%	47.9%
	Don't know	Count	9	14	7	47	13	20	16	126
		% within libcon	19.6%	24.6%	11.9%	20.3%	11.7%	12.1%	12.7%	15.8%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	111	165	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas economy status * libcon Crosstabulation

Texas economy status * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	51	23	11	19	57	26	98	2	287
		% within 7 point Party ID	30.5%	28.7%	21.6%	20.7%	45.6%	38.8%	50.3%	18.2%	36.4%
	Worse	Count	83	40	37	54	58	33	71	6	382
		% within 7 point Party ID	49.7%	50.0%	72.5%	58.7%	46.4%	49.3%	36.4%	54.5%	48.5%
	Don't know	Count	33	17	3	19	10	8	26	3	119
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.8%	21.3%	5.9%	20.7%	8.0%	11.9%	13.3%	27.3%	15.1%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	125	67	195	11	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas economy status * age Crosstabulation

				а	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	37	90	109	55	291
		% within age	28.5%	41.5%	33.2%	44.0%	36.4%
	Worse	Count	51	99	185	48	383
		% within age	39.2%	45.6%	56.4%	38.4%	47.9%
	Don't know	Count	42	28	34	22	126

	% within age	32.3%	12.9%	10.4%	17.6%	15.8%
Total	Count	130	217	328	125	800
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	16	127	74	27	35	12	291
		% within Education	48.5%	42.2%	31.0%	35.1%	33.0%	27.9%	36.4%
	Worse	Count	13	115	128	42	57	27	382
		% within Education	39.4%	38.2%	53.6%	54.5%	53.8%	62.8%	47.8%
	Don't know	Count	4	59	37	8	14	4	126
		% within Education	12.1%	19.6%	15.5%	10.4%	13.2%	9.3%	15.8%
Total		Count	33	301	239	77	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas economy status * Education Crosstabulation

Texas economy status * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than		A few times a	Once or twice a	Never	Tatal
		_	once a week	Unce a week	month	year	Never	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	44	48	33	78	88	291
		% within Religious attendance	31.9%	37.8%	37.1%	36.1%	38.1%	36.3%
	Worse	Count	70	64	44	103	102	383
		% within Religious attendance	50.7%	50.4%	49.4%	47.7%	44.2%	47.8%
	Don't know	Count	24	15	12	35	41	127
		% within Religious attendance	17.4%	11.8%	13.5%	16.2%	17.7%	15.9%
Total		Count	138	127	89	216	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas economy status * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	185	24	63	4	3	8	3	290
		% within Race	36.6%	25.0%	43.8%	40.0%	60.0%	53.3%	12.5%	36.3%
	Worse	Count	241	54	58	3	2	6	19	383
		% within Race	47.6%	56.3%	40.3%	30.0%	40.0%	40.0%	79.2%	47.9%
	Don't know	Count	80	18	23	3	0	1	2	127
		% within Race	15.8%	18.8%	16.0%	30.0%	.0%	6.7%	8.3%	15.9%
Total		Count	506	96	144	10	5	15	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas economy status * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	169	6	39	12	49	16	291
		% within Marital Status	36.9%	50.0%	40.6%	34.3%	31.2%	39.0%	36.4%
	Worse	Count	223	4	46	16	72	21	382
		% within Marital Status	48.7%	33.3%	47.9%	45.7%	45.9%	51.2%	47.8%
	Don't know	Count	66	2	11	7	36	4	126
		% within Marital Status	14.4%	16.7%	11.5%	20.0%	22.9%	9.8%	15.8%
Total		Count	458	12	96	35	157	41	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas economy status * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Texas economy status	Better	Count	161	130	291
		% within Gender	43.3%	30.4%	36.4%
	Worse	Count	171	211	382
		% within Gender	46.0%	49.3%	47.8%
	Don't know	Count	40	87	127

	% within Gender	10.8%	20.3%	15.9%
Total	Count	372	428	800
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	l exas ec	onomy status * urban/suburban/i	ural Crossia	bulation		
			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban Suburban Rural Total t 86 138 67			
Texas economy status	Better	Count	86	138	67	291
		% within urban/suburban/rural	40.2%	35.4%	35.1%	36.6%
	Worse Count		93	196	94	383
		% within urban/suburban/rural	43.5%	50.3%	49.2%	48.2%
	Don't know	Count	35	56	30	121
		% within urban/suburban/rural	16.4%	14.4%	15.7%	15.2%
Total		Count	214	390	191	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Toxas aconomy status * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Texas economy status * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston area	Dallas-Fort Worth area	the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	another part of Texas	Total
Toxas oconomy status	Bottor	Count	50	97	20	20	02	297
Texas economy status	Dellei	Count	50	07	20	29	93	207
		% within metro area	32.3%	36.3%	43.8%	41.4%	34.7%	36.0%
	Worse	Count	84	108	27	36	128	383
		% within metro area	54.2%	45.0%	42.2%	51.4%	47.8%	48.1%
	Don't know	Count	21	45	9	5	47	127
		% within metro area	13.5%	18.8%	14.1%	7.1%	17.5%	15.9%
Total		Count	155	240	64	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	3	0	1	5	2	3	3	17

		% within libcon	6.5%	.0%	1.7%	2.2%	1.8%	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	9	13	18	33	20	22	12	127
		% within libcon	19.6%	22.8%	30.5%	14.2%	17.9%	13.4%	9.6%	16.0%
	About the same	Count	20	32	24	91	45	63	43	318
		% within libcon	43.5%	56.1%	40.7%	39.2%	40.2%	38.4%	34.4%	40.0%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	10	9	11	47	30	52	37	196
		% within libcon	21.7%	15.8%	18.6%	20.3%	26.8%	31.7%	29.6%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	4	2	5	45	15	24	30	125
		% within libcon	8.7%	3.5%	8.5%	19.4%	13.4%	14.6%	24.0%	15.7%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	0	11	0	0	0	12
		% within libcon	.0%	1.8%	.0%	4.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
Total		Count	46	57	59	232	112	164	125	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

-						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	4	3	1	3	0	2	3	0	16
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	3.8%	2.0%	3.2%	.0%	3.1%	1.5%	.0%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	34	18	8	12	12	7	32	2	125
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.2%	22.8%	15.7%	12.9%	9.6%	10.8%	16.4%	16.7%	15.9%
	About the same	Count	76	24	27	41	36	31	77	3	315
		% within 7 point Party ID	45.2%	30.4%	52.9%	44.1%	28.8%	47.7%	39.5%	25.0%	40.0%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	31	16	9	22	51	15	49	2	195
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.5%	20.3%	17.6%	23.7%	40.8%	23.1%	25.1%	16.7%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	19	12	6	15	26	10	34	3	125
		% within 7 point Party ID	11.3%	15.2%	11.8%	16.1%	20.8%	15.4%	17.4%	25.0%	15.9%
	Don't know	Count	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	12
		% within 7 point Party ID	2.4%	7.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	1.5%
Total		Count	168	79	51	93	125	65	195	12	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	3	7	3	4	17
		% within age	2.3%	3.2%	.9%	3.2%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	24	41	54	7	126
		% within age	18.3%	18.9%	16.5%	5.6%	15.7%
	About the same	Count	54	99	117	52	322

		% within age	41.2%	45.6%	35.8%	41.3%	40.2%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	27	41	89	41	198
		% within age	20.6%	18.9%	27.2%	32.5%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	14	26	64	22	126
		% within age	10.7%	12.0%	19.6%	17.5%	15.7%
	Don't know	Count	9	3	0	0	12
		% within age	6.9%	1.4%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
Total		Count	131	217	327	126	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * Education Crosstabulation

-					Education	1			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	0	4	6	1	3	3	17
		% within Education	.0%	1.3%	2.5%	1.3%	2.8%	6.8%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	6	42	35	9	22	13	127
		% within Education	18.2%	14.0%	14.6%	11.7%	20.6%	29.5%	15.9%
	About the same	Count	17	111	97	35	48	14	322
		% within Education	51.5%	37.0%	40.4%	45.5%	44.9%	31.8%	40.2%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	5	74	65	21	25	8	198
		% within Education	15.2%	24.7%	27.1%	27.3%	23.4%	18.2%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	5	59	36	11	8	6	125
		% within Education	15.2%	19.7%	15.0%	14.3%	7.5%	13.6%	15.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	10	1	0	1	0	12
		% within Education	.0%	3.3%	.4%	.0%	.9%	.0%	1.5%
Total		Count	33	300	240	77	107	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	4	3	3	3	3	16
		% within Religious attendance	2.9%	2.4%	3.4%	1.4%	1.3%	2.0%

	Somewhat better off	Count	26	21	12	27	40	126
		% within Religious attendance	19.0%	16.7%	13.6%	12.5%	17.2%	15.8%
	About the same	Count	51	45	42	78	107	323
		% within Religious attendance	37.2%	35.7%	47.7%	36.1%	46.1%	40.4%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	32	33	15	71	48	199
		% within Religious attendance	23.4%	26.2%	17.0%	32.9%	20.7%	24.9%
	A lot worse off	Count	24	24	11	34	31	124
		% within Religious attendance	17.5%	19.0%	12.5%	15.7%	13.4%	15.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	5	3	3	11
		% within Religious attendance	.0%	.0%	5.7%	1.4%	1.3%	1.4%
Total		Count	137	126	88	216	232	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	7	4	3	1	0	1	0	16
		% within Race	1.4%	4.1%	2.1%	10.0%	.0%	7.1%	.0%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	67	27	29	3	0	0	0	126
		% within Race	13.2%	27.8%	20.1%	30.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	15.7%
	About the same	Count	198	35	71	1	3	8	7	323
		% within Race	39.1%	36.1%	49.3%	10.0%	60.0%	57.1%	29.2%	40.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	153	11	20	3	2	2	7	198
		% within Race	30.2%	11.3%	13.9%	30.0%	40.0%	14.3%	29.2%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	78	15	17	2	0	3	10	125
		% within Race	15.4%	15.5%	11.8%	20.0%	.0%	21.4%	41.7%	15.6%
	Don't know	Count	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	13
		% within Race	.8%	5.2%	2.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	14	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Marit	al Status			
			Morried	Separated	Divorand	Widowod	Single	Domestic	Total
	-	-	Married	Separated	Divorced	vvidowed	Single	partnership	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	7	0	3	1	6	0	17
		% within Marital Status	1.5%	.0%	3.1%	2.9%	3.8%	.0%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	74	5	15	2	24	7	127
		% within Marital Status	16.2%	38.5%	15.5%	5.7%	15.3%	17.9%	15.9%
	About the same	Count	192	6	38	14	58	14	322
		% within Marital Status	41.9%	46.2%	39.2%	40.0%	36.9%	35.9%	40.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	121	2	19	13	35	7	197
		% within Marital Status	26.4%	15.4%	19.6%	37.1%	22.3%	17.9%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	59	0	22	5	27	11	124
		% within Marital Status	12.9%	.0%	22.7%	14.3%	17.2%	28.2%	15.5%
	Don't know	Count	5	0	0	0	7	0	12
		% within Marital Status	1.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.5%	.0%	1.5%
Total		Count	458	13	97	35	157	39	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Family economy status * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	10	6	16
		% within Gender	2.7%	1.4%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	60	67	127
		% within Gender	16.1%	15.7%	15.9%
	About the same	Count	154	168	322
		% within Gender	41.4%	39.3%	40.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	104	93	197
		% within Gender	28.0%	21.8%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	44	81	125
		% within Gender	11.8%	19.0%	15.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	12	12
		% within Gender	.0%	2.8%	1.5%
Total		Count	372	427	799

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	10	6	16
		% within Gender	2.7%	1.4%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	60	67	127
		% within Gender	16.1%	15.7%	15.9%
	About the same	Count	154	168	322
		% within Gender	41.4%	39.3%	40.3%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	104	93	197
		% within Gender	28.0%	21.8%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	44	81	125
		% within Gender	11.8%	19.0%	15.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	12	12
1		% within Gender	.0%	2.8%	1.5%
Total		Count	372	427	799
1		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * Gender Crosstabulation

Family economy status * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	5	6	5	16
		% within urban/suburban/rural	2.3%	1.5%	2.6%	2.0%
	Somewhat better off	Count	47	67	14	128
		% within urban/suburban/rural	21.9%	17.2%	7.4%	16.1%
	About the same	Count	86	158	79	323
		% within urban/suburban/rural	40.0%	40.5%	41.6%	40.6%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	51	88	58	197
		% within urban/suburban/rural	23.7%	22.6%	30.5%	24.8%
	A lot worse off	Count	22	68	33	123
		% within urban/suburban/rural	10.2%	17.4%	17.4%	15.5%
	Don't know	Count	4	3	1	8
		% within urban/suburban/rural	1.9%	.8%	.5%	1.0%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					metro area			-
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Family economy status	A lot better off	Count	5	5	0	1	6	17
		% within metro area	3.2%	2.1%	.0%	1.4%	2.2%	2.1%
	Somewhat better off	Count	27	37	9	22	32	127
		% within metro area	17.3%	15.4%	14.3%	31.4%	12.0%	16.0%
	About the same	Count	62	110	28	25	93	318
		% within metro area	39.7%	45.8%	44.4%	35.7%	34.8%	39.9%
	Somewhat worse off	Count	39	49	14	16	79	197
		% within metro area	25.0%	20.4%	22.2%	22.9%	29.6%	24.7%
	A lot worse off	Count	20	39	10	5	51	125
		% within metro area	12.8%	16.3%	15.9%	7.1%	19.1%	15.7%
	Don't know	Count	3	0	2	1	6	12
		% within metro area	1.9%	.0%	3.2%	1.4%	2.2%	1.5%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Family economy status * metro area Crosstabulation

Primary vote * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	1	2	8	47	80	133	117	388
		% within libcon	2.2%	3.4%	13.6%	20.3%	71.4%	80.6%	93.6%	48.7%
	Democratic Primary	Count	30	42	40	113	17	11	3	256
		% within libcon	65.2%	72.4%	67.8%	48.9%	15.2%	6.7%	2.4%	32.2%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	15	14	11	71	15	21	5	152
	primaries	% within libcon	32.6%	24.1%	18.6%	30.7%	13.4%	12.7%	4.0%	19.1%
Total		Count	46	58	59	231	112	165	125	796
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

				7 point Pa	arty ID				
		Not very				Not very			
	Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong	1 '	1 '
	Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total
Primary vote Republican Primary Count	2	5	3	27	101	55	186	3	382

	_	% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	6.3%	5.9%	29.3%	81.5%	83.3%	94.9%	23.1%	48.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	146	55	31	15	1	0	1	4	253
		% within 7 point Party ID	87.4%	68.8%	60.8%	16.3%	.8%	.0%	.5%	30.8%	32.1%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	19	20	17	50	22	11	9	6	154
	primaries	% within 7 point Party ID	11.4%	25.0%	33.3%	54.3%	17.7%	16.7%	4.6%	46.2%	19.5%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	124	66	196	13	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	37	109	158	84	388
		% within age	28.5%	50.2%	48.2%	67.2%	48.5%
	Democratic Primary	Count	51	58	118	28	255
		% within age	39.2%	26.7%	36.0%	22.4%	31.9%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	42	50	52	13	157
		% within age	32.3%	23.0%	15.9%	10.4%	19.6%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Education Crosstabulation

				Education						
				High school						
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	16	145	116	42	47	22	388	
		% within Education	50.0%	48.3%	48.1%	54.5%	43.9%	50.0%	48.4%	
	Democratic Primary	Count	6	86	84	27	37	16	256	
		% within Education	18.8%	28.7%	34.9%	35.1%	34.6%	36.4%	32.0%	
	Don't usually vote in	Count	10	69	41	8	23	6	157	
	primaries	% within Education	31.3%	23.0%	17.0%	10.4%	21.5%	13.6%	19.6%	
Total		Count	32	300	241	77	107	44	801	
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than	Once a week	A few times a	Once or twice	Never	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	95	80	39	95 a year	78	387
T minury voto		% within Religious attendance	68.8%	63.5%	44.3%	44.0%	33.8%	48.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	29	29	35	71	92	256
		% within Religious attendance	21.0%	23.0%	39.8%	32.9%	39.8%	32.0%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	14	17	14	50	61	156
	primaries	% within Religious attendance	10.1%	13.5%	15.9%	23.1%	26.4%	19.5%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Primary vote * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	293	11	53	3	5	5	17	387
		% within Race	57.9%	11.3%	36.8%	33.3%	100.0%	35.7%	73.9%	48.5%
	Democratic Primary	Count	122	73	51	3	0	5	1	255
		% within Race	24.1%	75.3%	35.4%	33.3%	.0%	35.7%	4.3%	32.0%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	91	13	40	3	0	4	5	156
	primaries	% within Race	18.0%	13.4%	27.8%	33.3%	.0%	28.6%	21.7%	19.5%
Total		Count	506	97	144	9	5	14	23	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Marital Status						
		Ţ.	,		,,	,	,	Domestic		
		/	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total	
rimary vote	Republican Primary	Count	264	6	40	20	42	15	387	
		% within Marital Status	57.5%	50.0%	41.2%	57.1%	26.9%	36.6%	48.4%	

Primary vote * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	Democratic Primary	Count	122	3	42	6	68	15	256
		% within Marital Status	26.6%	25.0%	43.3%	17.1%	43.6%	36.6%	32.0%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	73	3	15	9	46	11	157
	primaries	% within Marital Status	15.9%	25.0%	15.5%	25.7%	29.5%	26.8%	19.6%
Total		Count	459	12	97	35	156	41	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	208	179	387
		% within Gender	55.8%	41.9%	48.4%
	Democratic Primary	Count	104	152	256
		% within Gender	27.9%	35.6%	32.0%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	61	96	157
		% within Gender	16.4%	22.5%	19.6%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	82	187	117	386
		% within urban/suburban/rural	38.5%	47.9%	61.6%	48.7%
	Democratic Primary	Count	83	137	31	251
		% within urban/suburban/rural	39.0%	35.1%	16.3%	31.7%
	Don't usually vote in primaries	Count	48	66	42	156
		% within urban/suburban/rural	22.5%	16.9%	22.1%	19.7%
Total		Count	213	390	190	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Primary vote *	[•] metro area (Crossta	bulation
----------------	---------------------------	---------	----------

I I IIIai		
	metro area	Total
		-

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Primary vote	Republican Primary	Count	65	107	32	32	147	383
		% within metro area	41.9%	44.6%	50.8%	45.7%	55.1%	48.2%
	Democratic Primary	Count	59	83	17	29	68	256
		% within metro area	38.1%	34.6%	27.0%	41.4%	25.5%	32.2%
	Don't usually vote in	Count	31	50	14	9	52	156
	primaries	% within metro area	20.0%	20.8%	22.2%	12.9%	19.5%	19.6%
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

libcon Extremely Extremely liberal1 2 5 6 3 In the middle4 conservative7 Total Roger Williams Republican senate Count 0 0 0 1 3 3 0 primary % within libcon .0% 2.2% .0% .0% 2.2% 3.8% .0% 1.8% 36 David Dewhurst Count 0 0 2 3 18 39 .0% .0% 25.0% 25.4% % within libcon 6.5% 22.5% 29.1% 31.0% Michael Williams Count 0 0 0 6 1 7 8 % within libcon .0% .0% .0% 13.0% 1.3% 5.2% 6.9% 5.7% Elizabeth Ames Jones Count 0 0 0 2 0 1 1 % within libcon .0% .0% .0% 4.3% .0% .7% .9% 1.0% Ted Cruz Count 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 .0% .0% .0% .0% .0% 2.2% 2.6% 1.6% % within libcon Tom Leppert Count 0 1 1 1 4 5 3 % within libcon .0% 100.0% 12.5% 2.2% 5.0% 3.7% 2.6% 3.9% Michael McCaul Count 0 0 0 0 4 5 6 % within libcon .0% .0% .0% .0% 5.0% 3.7% 5.2% 3.9% Another Republican Count 0 0 6 13 3 1 3 candidate % within libcon .0% .0% 12.5% 13.0% 3.8% 9.7% 2.6% 6.7% Don't Know Count 0 27 47 58 56 193 1 4 % within libcon 100.0% .0% 50.0% 58.7% 58.8% 43.3% 48.3% 50.0% Total Count 46 80 134 116 386 1 8 1

Republican senate primary * libcon Crosstabulation

7

98

22

4

6

15

15

26

100.0%

Republican senate primary * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

100.0%

100.0%

100.0%

100.0%

100.0%

100.0%

100.0%

% within libcon

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	7
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	5.5%	1.6%	.0%	1.8%
	David Dewhurst	Count	0	0	1	6	19	10	59	0	95
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	33.3%	23.1%	19.0%	18.2%	31.7%	.0%	25.1%
	Michael Williams	Count	0	0	0	2	12	1	6	1	22
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.7%	12.0%	1.8%	3.2%	50.0%	5.8%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	.3%
	Ted Cruz	Count	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	7
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.0%	3.6%	.5%	.0%	1.8%
	Tom Leppert	Count	0	1	0	2	0	2	8	0	13
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	20.0%	.0%	7.7%	.0%	3.6%	4.3%	.0%	3.4%
	Michael McCaul	Count	0	0	0	1	3	0	11	0	15
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.8%	3.0%	.0%	5.9%	.0%	4.0%
	Another Republican	Count	0	0	1	4	7	2	13	0	27
	candidate	% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	33.3%	15.4%	7.0%	3.6%	7.0%	.0%	7.1%
	Don't Know	Count	2	4	1	11	54	34	85	1	192
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	80.0%	33.3%	42.3%	54.0%	61.8%	45.7%	50.0%	50.7%
Total		Count	2	5	3	26	100	55	186	2	379
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	1	5	0	1	7
		% within age	2.7%	4.6%	.0%	1.2%	1.8%
	David Dewhurst	Count	12	31	33	22	98
		% within age	32.4%	28.7%	20.9%	25.9%	25.3%
	Michael Williams	Count	5	6	7	5	23
		% within age	13.5%	5.6%	4.4%	5.9%	5.9%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	3	0	1	4
		% within age	.0%	2.8%	.0%	1.2%	1.0%
	Ted Cruz	Count	1	0	3	3	7
		% within age	2.7%	.0%	1.9%	3.5%	1.8%
	Tom Leppert	Count	0	3	9	2	14
		% within age	.0%	2.8%	5.7%	2.4%	3.6%
	Michael McCaul	Count	0	4	7	4	15
		% within age	.0%	3.7%	4.4%	4.7%	3.9%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	2	6	11	8	27
		% within age	5.4%	5.6%	7.0%	9.4%	7.0%

	Don't Know	Count	16	50	88	39	193
		% within age	43.2%	46.3%	55.7%	45.9%	49.7%
Total		Count	37	108	158	85	388
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Education	1			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	0	0	2	3	2	0	7
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	1.7%	7.1%	4.3%	.0%	1.8%
l	David Dewhurst	Count	7	32	29	9	14	8	99
		% within Education	43.8%	22.1%	25.0%	21.4%	29.8%	36.4%	25.5%
	Michael Williams	Count	3	6	5	2	6	1	23
		% within Education	18.8%	4.1%	4.3%	4.8%	12.8%	4.5%	5.9%
l	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
		% within Education	.0%	1.4%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	Ted Cruz	Count	0	5	1	0	1 '	0	7
		% within Education	.0%	3.4%	.9%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	1.8%
	Tom Leppert	Count	0	5	3	2	2	2	14
		% within Education	.0%	3.4%	2.6%	4.8%	4.3%	9.1%	3.6%
	Michael McCaul	Count	0	1	6	4	2	2	15
		% within Education	.0%	.7%	5.2%	9.5%	4.3%	9.1%	3.9%
	Another Republican	Count	0	10	6	4	3	4	27
	candidate	% within Education	.0%	6.9%	5.2%	9.5%	6.4%	18.2%	7.0%
	Don't Know	Count	6	84	64	17	17	5	193
		% within Education	37.5%	57.9%	55.2%	40.5%	36.2%	22.7%	49.7%
Total		Count	16	145	116	42	47	22	388
1		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Education Crosstabulation

Republican senate primary * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	igious attendance			,
		,	More than	· · · ·	A few times a	Once or twice a		, 1
			once a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	1	3	2	0	1	7
		% within Religious attendance	1.1%	3.8%	5.3%	.0%	1.3%	1.8%
1	David Dewhurst	Count	26	21	10	28	12	97

		% within Religious attendance	27.4%	26.3%	26.3%	29.8%	15.2%	25.1%
	Michael Williams	Count	4	8	3	4	4	23
		% within Religious attendance	4.2%	10.0%	7.9%	4.3%	5.1%	6.0%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	3	0	0	0	0	3
		% within Religious attendance	3.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	Ted Cruz	Count	2	0	0	4	0	6
		% within Religious attendance	2.1%	.0%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	1.6%
	Tom Leppert	Count	5	5	0	4	0	14
		% within Religious attendance	5.3%	6.3%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	3.6%
	Michael McCaul	Count	4	6	2	1	2	15
		% within Religious attendance	4.2%	7.5%	5.3%	1.1%	2.5%	3.9%
	Another Republican	Count	6	4	8	4	5	27
	candidate	% within Religious attendance	6.3%	5.0%	21.1%	4.3%	6.3%	7.0%
	Don't Know	Count	44	33	13	49	55	194
		% within Religious attendance	46.3%	41.3%	34.2%	52.1%	69.6%	50.3%
Total		Count	95	80	38	94	79	386
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco Black Hispanic Asian nativo Mixed Other							
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	7
		% within Race	1.7%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	5.9%	1.8%
	David Dewhurst	Count	74	3	16	0	0	1	3	97
		% within Race	25.3%	27.3%	30.8%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	17.6%	25.1%
	Michael Williams	Count	16	2	3	0	0	0	2	23
		% within Race	5.5%	18.2%	5.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.8%	5.9%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Race	1.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%

	Ted Cruz	Count	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	7
		% within Race	.7%	.0%	9.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.8%
	Tom Leppert	Count	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	14
		% within Race	4.1%	9.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5.9%	3.6%
	Michael McCaul	Count	12	1	1	0	0	1	0	15
		% within Race	4.1%	9.1%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	3.9%
	Another Republican	Count	22	0	1	0	1	3	1	28
	candidate	% within Race	7.5%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	20.0%	50.0%	5.9%	7.2%
	Don't Know	Count	147	4	25	2	4	1	9	192
		% within Race	50.2%	36.4%	48.1%	66.7%	80.0%	16.7%	52.9%	49.6%
Total		Count	293	11	52	3	5	6	17	387
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	5	0	1	0	1	0	7
		% within Marital Status	1.9%	.0%	2.6%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	1.8%
	David Dewhurst	Count	68	3	11	4	12	0	98
		% within Marital Status	25.8%	42.9%	28.2%	20.0%	28.6%	.0%	25.3%
	Michael Williams	Count	16	0	0	0	6	0	22
		% within Marital Status	6.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	.0%	5.7%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Marital Status	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
	Ted Cruz	Count	6	0	0	0	1	0	7
		% within Marital Status	2.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	1.8%
	Tom Leppert	Count	10	0	4	1	0	0	15
		% within Marital Status	3.8%	.0%	10.3%	5.0%	.0%	.0%	3.9%
	Michael McCaul	Count	12	0	0	1	1	0	14
		% within Marital Status	4.5%	.0%	.0%	5.0%	2.4%	.0%	3.6%
	Another Republican	Count	17	0	4	2	2	1	26
	candidate	% within Marital Status	6.4%	.0%	10.3%	10.0%	4.8%	6.7%	6.7%
	Don't Know	Count	126	4	19	12	19	14	194
		% within Marital Status	47.7%	57.1%	48.7%	60.0%	45.2%	93.3%	50.1%
Total		Count	264	7	39	20	42	15	387
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gen	der	-
			Male	Female	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	1	6	7
		% within Gender	.5%	3.3%	1.8%
	David Dewhurst	Count	57	41	98
		% within Gender	27.4%	22.8%	25.3%
	Michael Williams	Count	14	9	23
		% within Gender	6.7%	5.0%	5.9%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	4	4
		% within Gender	.0%	2.2%	1.0%
	Ted Cruz	Count	6	1	7
		% within Gender	2.9%	.6%	1.8%
	Tom Leppert	Count	8	6	14
		% within Gender	3.8%	3.3%	3.6%
	Michael McCaul	Count	8	7	15
		% within Gender	3.8%	3.9%	3.9%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	19	8	27
		% within Gender	9.1%	4.4%	7.0%
	Don't Know	Count	95	98	193
		% within Gender	45.7%	54.4%	49.7%
Total		Count	208	180	388
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican senate primary * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	3	3	1	7
		% within urban/suburban/rural	3.7%	1.6%	.9%	1.8%
	David Dewhurst Count % within urban/suburban/rural		22	44	31	97
			26.8%	23.4%	26.7%	25.1%
	Michael Williams	Michael Williams Count			6	23
		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.3%	5.9%	5.2%	6.0%
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	0	3	3
		% within urban/suburban/rural	.0%	.0%	2.6%	.8%
	Ted Cruz	Count	6	0	0	6
		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.3%	.0%	.0%	1.6%

	Tom Leppert	Count	3	8	4	15
		% within urban/suburban/rural	3.7%	4.3%	3.4%	3.9%
	Michael McCaul	Count	3	12	0	15
		% within urban/suburban/rural	3.7%	6.4%	.0%	3.9%
	Another Republican candidate	Count	3	16	8	27
		% within urban/suburban/rural	3.7%	8.5%	6.9%	7.0%
	Don't Know	Count	36	94	63	193
		% within urban/suburban/rural	43.9%	50.0%	54.3%	50.0%
Total		Count	82	188	116	386
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		Republican senate	in senate primary "metro area Crosstabulation										
					metro area								
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total					
Republican senate primary	Roger Williams	Count	0	5	0	0	2	7					
		% within metro area	.0%	4.7%	.0%	.0%	1.4%	1.8%					
	David Dewhurst	Count	15	32	5	6	40	98					
		% within metro area	23.1%	30.2%	15.6%	18.2%	27.2%	25.6%					
	Michael Williams	Count	4	9	4	2	4	23					
		% within metro area	6.2%	8.5%	12.5%	6.1%	2.7%	6.0%					
	Elizabeth Ames Jones	Count	0	1	1	0	2	4					
		% within metro area	.0%	.9%	3.1%	.0%	1.4%	1.0%					
	Ted Cruz	Count	0	1	3	1	2	7					
		% within metro area	.0%	.9%	9.4%	3.0%	1.4%	1.8%					
	Tom Leppert	Count	0	11	0	0	3	14					
		% within metro area	.0%	10.4%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	3.7%					
	Michael McCaul	Count	6	0	0	5	3	14					
		% within metro area	9.2%	.0%	.0%	15.2%	2.0%	3.7%					
	Another Republican	Count	9	5	0	3	10	27					
	candidate	% within metro area	13.8%	4.7%	.0%	9.1%	6.8%	7.0%					
	Don't Know	Count	31	42	19	16	81	189					
		% within metro area	47.7%	39.6%	59.4%	48.5%	55.1%	49.3%					
Total		Count	65	106	32	33	147	383					
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					

Republican senate primary * metro area Crosstabulation

Republican presidential primary * libcon Crosstabulation

69

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
	_ <u>_</u>	_	liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	0	0	0	1	8	13	6	28
primary		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	9.9%	9.8%	5.0%	7.2%
	Sarah Palin	Count	0	0	2	7	5	14	16	44
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	25.0%	15.9%	6.2%	10.5%	13.4%	11.4%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	0	0	0	0	5	10	13	28
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.2%	7.5%	10.9%	7.2%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	0	0	2	2	2	24	12	42
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	25.0%	4.5%	2.5%	18.0%	10.1%	10.9%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	0	0	0	8	11	5	14	38
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	18.2%	13.6%	3.8%	11.8%	9.8%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	0	0	0	1	6	5	5	17
	-	% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	7.4%	3.8%	4.2%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.2%	1.5%	.8%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	14
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	3.7%	3.8%	4.2%	3.6%
	Ron Paul	Count	0	0	2	8	9	13	9	41
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	25.0%	18.2%	11.1%	9.8%	7.6%	10.6%
	Donald Trump	Count	0	0	0	2	9	7	6	24
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.5%	11.1%	5.3%	5.0%	6.2%
	Rick Santorum	Count	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	13
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.3%	2.5%	2.3%	5.9%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	4
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.5%	.0%	.8%	.8%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	1	0	1	2	8	12	13	37
		% within libcon	100.0%	.0%	12.5%	- 4.5%	9.9%	9.0%	10.9%	9.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	1	1	9	12	19	11	53
	Dont Know	% within libcon	0%	100.0%	12.5%	20.5%	14.8%	14.3%	9.2%	13 7%
Total		Count	.070	100.070	12.070	44	81	133	119	387
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Republican presidential primary	Mitt Romney	Count	0	1	0	1	7	2	16	1	28
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	20.0%	.0%	3.7%	6.8%	3.7%	8.6%	50.0%	7.3%
	Sarah Palin	Count	0	0	0	3	12	9	21	0	45
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.1%	11.7%	16.7%	11.4%	.0%	11.8%

	Michele Bachmann	Count	0	0	0	1	9	3	14	0	27
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.7%	8.7%	5.6%	7.6%	.0%	7.1%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	0	0	0	0	8	5	28	0	41
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.8%	9.3%	15.1%	.0%	10.8%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	0	3	0	0	5	6	21	0	35
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%	4.9%	11.1%	11.4%	.0%	9.2%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	0	0	1	0	10	0	6	0	17
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	9.7%	.0%	3.2%	.0%	4.5%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	0	14
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.9%	1.9%	5.4%	.0%	3.7%
	Ron Paul	Count	1	0	1	8	22	2	5	1	40
		% within 7 point Party ID	50.0%	.0%	33.3%	29.6%	21.4%	3.7%	2.7%	50.0%	10.5%
	Donald Trump	Count	0	0	0	2	8	7	7	0	24
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.4%	7.8%	13.0%	3.8%	.0%	6.3%
	Rick Santorum	Count	0	1	0	0	4	0	8	0	13
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	3.9%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	4
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.4%	1.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	1	0	1	4	4	8	20	0	38
		% within 7 point Party ID	50.0%	.0%	33.3%	14.8%	3.9%	14.8%	10.8%	.0%	10.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	0	0	6	8	11	26	0	51
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	7.8%	20.4%	14.1%	.0%	13.4%
Total		Count	2	5	3	27	103	54	185	2	381
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	1	10	10	7	28
primary		% within age	2.7%	9.0%	6.3%	8.2%	7.2%
	Sarah Palin	Count	2	17	16	9	44
		% within age	5.4%	15.3%	10.1%	10.6%	11.3%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	1	3	14	10	28
		% within age	2.7%	2.7%	8.9%	11.8%	7.2%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	2	11	18	11	42
		% within age	5.4%	9.9%	11.4%	12.9%	10.7%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	1	14	14	10	39
		% within age	2.7%	12.6%	8.9%	11.8%	10.0%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	1	5	6	4	16
		% within age	2.7%	4.5%	3.8%	4.7%	4.1%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	2	2	0	4

		% within age	.0%	1.8%	1.3%	.0%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	4	4	6	1	15
		% within age	10.8%	3.6%	3.8%	1.2%	3.8%
	Ron Paul	Count	10	10	15	5	40
		% within age	27.0%	9.0%	9.5%	5.9%	10.2%
	Donald Trump	Count	3	6	10	5	24
		% within age	8.1%	5.4%	6.3%	5.9%	6.1%
	Rick Santorum	Count	0	5	5	4	14
		% within age	.0%	4.5%	3.2%	4.7%	3.6%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	2	0	1	1	4
		% within age	5.4%	.0%	.6%	1.2%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	6	10	16	6	38
		% within age	16.2%	9.0%	10.1%	7.1%	9.7%
	Don't know	Count	4	14	25	12	55
		% within age	10.8%	12.6%	15.8%	14.1%	14.1%
Total		Count	37	111	158	85	391
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	0	8	10	3	4	3	28
primary		% within Education	.0%	5.6%	8.7%	7.1%	8.9%	14.3%	7.3%
	Sarah Palin	Count	5	18	10	6	4	3	46
		% within Education	31.3%	12.5%	8.7%	14.3%	8.9%	14.3%	12.0%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	2	13	4	4	3	0	26
		% within Education	12.5%	9.0%	3.5%	9.5%	6.7%	.0%	6.8%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	0	15	14	4	7	2	42
		% within Education	.0%	10.4%	12.2%	9.5%	15.6%	9.5%	11.0%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	0	17	11	3	4	2	37
		% within Education	.0%	11.8%	9.6%	7.1%	8.9%	9.5%	9.7%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	0	9	3	3	1	1	17
		% within Education	.0%	6.3%	2.6%	7.1%	2.2%	4.8%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	1	2	0	1	0	4
		% within Education	.0%	.7%	1.7%	.0%	2.2%	.0%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	2	1	6	3	1	0	13
		% within Education	12.5%	.7%	5.2%	7.1%	2.2%	.0%	3.4%
	Ron Paul	Count	1	11	14	3	5	5	39
-------	---------------	--------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
		% within Education	6.3%	7.6%	12.2%	7.1%	11.1%	23.8%	10.2%
	Donald Trump	Count	2	8	8	3	2	0	23
		% within Education	12.5%	5.6%	7.0%	7.1%	4.4%	.0%	6.0%
	Rick Santorum	Count	0	7	3	2	0	1	13
		% within Education	.0%	4.9%	2.6%	4.8%	.0%	4.8%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
		% within Education	.0%	1.4%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
	Someone else	Count	0	16	10	3	5	3	37
		% within Education	.0%	11.1%	8.7%	7.1%	11.1%	14.3%	9.7%
	Don't know	Count	4	18	19	5	8	1	55
		% within Education	25.0%	12.5%	16.5%	11.9%	17.8%	4.8%	14.4%
Total		Count	16	144	115	42	45	21	383
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary Religious attenuance crossiapulation	Republican	presidential	primary * Reli	igious attendance	Crosstabulatio
--	------------	--------------	----------------	-------------------	----------------

-				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	5	9	4	2	8	28
primary		% within Religious attendance	5.3%	11.1%	10.3%	2.2%	10.0%	7.2%
	Sarah Palin	Count	14	10	4	11	6	45
		% within Religious attendance	14.9%	12.3%	10.3%	11.8%	7.5%	11.6%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	5	2	4	10	6	27
		% within Religious attendance	5.3%	2.5%	10.3%	10.8%	7.5%	7.0%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	14	7	2	14	6	43
		% within Religious attendance	14.9%	8.6%	5.1%	15.1%	7.5%	11.1%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	18	8	2	3	7	38
		% within Religious attendance	19.1%	9.9%	5.1%	3.2%	8.8%	9.8%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	3	2	1	4	7	17
		% within Religious attendance	3.2%	2.5%	2.6%	4.3%	8.8%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	2	0	0	2	4
		% within Religious attendance	.0%	2.5%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	1	2	2	5	3	13

		% within Religious attendance	1.1%	2.5%	5.1%	5.4%	3.8%	3.4%
	Ron Paul	Count	6	5	5	8	16	40
		% within Religious attendance	6.4%	6.2%	12.8%	8.6%	20.0%	10.3%
	Donald Trump	Count	5	4	3	8	3	23
		% within Religious attendance	5.3%	4.9%	7.7%	8.6%	3.8%	5.9%
	Rick Santorum	Count	2	6	0	4	1	13
		% within Religious attendance	2.1%	7.4%	.0%	4.3%	1.3%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	0	2	0	1	0	3
	_	% within Religious attendance	.0%	2.5%	.0%	1.1%	.0%	.8%
	Someone else	Count	9	3	9	12	5	38
		% within Religious attendance	9.6%	3.7%	23.1%	12.9%	6.3%	9.8%
	Don't know	Count	12	19	3	11	10	55
		% within Religious attendance	12.8%	23.5%	7.7%	11.8%	12.5%	14.2%
Total		Count	94	81	39	93	80	387
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	17	1	7	0	0	2	0	27
primary		% within Race	5.8%	10.0%	13.2%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	7.0%
	Sarah Palin	Count	29	1	8	3	0	1	3	45
		% within Race	9.9%	10.0%	15.1%	100.0%	.0%	16.7%	18.8%	11.7%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	13	1	8	0	0	0	4	26
		% within Race	4.5%	10.0%	15.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	6.8%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	39	0	1	0	0	0	2	42
		% within Race	13.4%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	10.9%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	35	0	3	0	0	0	0	38
		% within Race	12.0%	.0%	5.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	9.9%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	11	0	6	0	0	0	0	17

		% within Race	3.8%	.0%	11.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Race	1.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	10	0	3	0	0	0	1	14
		% within Race	3.4%	.0%	5.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.3%	3.6%
	Ron Paul	Count	32	0	1	0	3	3	2	41
		% within Race	11.0%	.0%	1.9%	.0%	60.0%	50.0%	12.5%	10.6%
	Donald Trump	Count	19	0	4	0	0	0	0	23
		% within Race	6.5%	.0%	7.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.0%
	Rick Santorum	Count	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	13
		% within Race	4.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Race	1.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	30	3	1	0	1	0	3	38
		% within Race	10.3%	30.0%	1.9%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	18.8%	9.9%
	Don't know	Count	38	4	10	0	0	0	1	53
		% within Race	13.0%	40.0%	18.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.3%	13.8%
Total		Count	292	10	53	3	5	6	16	385
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
								Domestic	
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	21	0	3	1	2	0	27
primary		% within Marital Status	8.0%	.0%	7.5%	4.5%	4.9%	.0%	7.0%
	Sarah Palin	Count	29	2	3	3	4	5	46
		% within Marital Status	11.1%	28.6%	7.5%	13.6%	9.8%	33.3%	11.9%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	17	0	2	4	3	0	26
		% within Marital Status	6.5%	.0%	5.0%	18.2%	7.3%	.0%	6.7%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	33	0	5	0	4	0	42
		% within Marital Status	12.6%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	9.8%	.0%	10.9%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	24	0	7	6	2	0	39
		% within Marital Status	9.2%	.0%	17.5%	27.3%	4.9%	.0%	10.1%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	7	1	2	0	7	0	17
		% within Marital Status	2.7%	14.3%	5.0%	.0%	17.1%	.0%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Marital Status	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%

	Rick Perry	Count	9	1	2	0	1	1	14
		% within Marital Status	3.4%	14.3%	5.0%	.0%	2.4%	6.7%	3.6%
	Ron Paul	Count	27	0	0	5	5	2	39
		% within Marital Status	10.3%	.0%	.0%	22.7%	12.2%	13.3%	10.1%
	Donald Trump	Count	14	0	2	1	5	1	23
		% within Marital Status	5.3%	.0%	5.0%	4.5%	12.2%	6.7%	5.9%
	Rick Santorum	Count	10	0	1	0	2	0	13
		% within Marital Status	3.8%	.0%	2.5%	.0%	4.9%	.0%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Marital Status	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
S	Someone else	Count	28	0	4	0	3	4	39
		% within Marital Status	10.7%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	7.3%	26.7%	10.1%
	Don't know	Count	35	3	9	2	3	2	54
		% within Marital Status	13.4%	42.9%	22.5%	9.1%	7.3%	13.3%	14.0%
Total		Count	262	7	40	22	41	15	387
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican	presidential	primary	* Gender	Crosstabulation
------------	--------------	---------	----------	-----------------

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	8	20	28
primary		% within Gender	3.8%	11.1%	7.2%
	Sarah Palin	Count	20	25	45
		% within Gender	9.6%	13.9%	11.6%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	19	8	27
		% within Gender	9.1%	4.4%	7.0%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	29	13	42
		% within Gender	13.9%	7.2%	10.8%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	14	25	39
		% within Gender	6.7%	13.9%	10.1%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	12	5	17
		% within Gender	5.8%	2.8%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	3	1	4
		% within Gender	1.4%	.6%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	4	10	14
		% within Gender	1.9%	5.6%	3.6%

	Ron Paul	Count	30	10	40
		% within Gender	14.4%	5.6%	10.3%
	Donald Trump	Count	12	12	24
		% within Gender	5.8%	6.7%	6.2%
	Rick Santorum	Count	9	5	14
		% within Gender	4.3%	2.8%	3.6%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	1	3	4
		% within Gender	.5%	1.7%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	24	13	37
		% within Gender	11.5%	7.2%	9.5%
	Don't know	Count	23	30	53
		% within Gender	11.1%	16.7%	13.7%
Total		Count	208	180	388
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	4	18	5	27
primary		% within urban/suburban/rural	4.9%	9.6%	4.3%	7.0%
	Sarah Palin	Count	11	21	13	45
		% within urban/suburban/rural	13.4%	11.2%	11.3%	11.7%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	4	12	11	27
		% within urban/suburban/rural	4.9%	6.4%	9.6%	7.0%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	10	24	8	42
		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.2%	12.8%	7.0%	10.9%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	8	9	20	37
		% within urban/suburban/rural	9.8%	4.8%	17.4%	9.6%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	6	9	2	17
		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.3%	4.8%	1.7%	4.4%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	4	0	4
		% within urban/suburban/rural	.0%	2.1%	.0%	1.0%
	Rick Perry	Count	6	3	5	14
		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.3%	1.6%	4.3%	3.6%
	Ron Paul	Count	8	22	11	41
		% within urban/suburban/rural	9.8%	11.8%	9.6%	10.7%

	Donald Trump	Count	4	10	8	22
		% within urban/suburban/rural	4.9%	5.3%	7.0%	5.7%
	Rick Santorum	Count	4	5	4	13
		% within urban/suburban/rural	4.9%	2.7%	3.5%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	0	4	0	4
		% within urban/suburban/rural	.0%	2.1%	.0%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	7	19	11	37
		% within urban/suburban/rural	8.5%	10.2%	9.6%	9.6%
	Don't know	Count	10	27	17	54
		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.2%	14.4%	14.8%	14.1%
Total		Count	82	187	115	384
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Republican presidential primary * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
				Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	
			Yes, I live in the	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Republican presidential	Mitt Romney	Count	2	12	1	6	7	28
primary		% within metro area	2.9%	11.2%	3.3%	18.8%	4.8%	7.3%
	Sarah Palin	Count	12	15	6	2	10	45
		% within metro area	17.6%	14.0%	20.0%	6.3%	6.8%	11.7%
	Michele Bachmann	Count	5	7	2	2	11	27
		% within metro area	7.4%	6.5%	6.7%	6.3%	7.5%	7.0%
	Newt Gingrich	Count	7	15	2	4	15	43
		% within metro area	10.3%	14.0%	6.7%	12.5%	10.2%	11.2%
	Mike Huckabee	Count	2	7	6	0	23	38
		% within metro area	2.9%	6.5%	20.0%	.0%	15.6%	9.9%
	Tim Pawlenty	Count	6	2	3	1	2	14
		% within metro area	8.8%	1.9%	10.0%	3.1%	1.4%	3.6%
	Mitch Daniels	Count	0	1	1	1	0	3
		% within metro area	.0%	.9%	3.3%	3.1%	.0%	.8%
	Rick Perry	Count	3	0	0	1	10	14
		% within metro area	4.4%	.0%	.0%	3.1%	6.8%	3.6%
	Ron Paul	Count	13	8	2	4	13	40
		% within metro area	19.1%	7.5%	6.7%	12.5%	8.8%	10.4%
	Donald Trump	Count	2	9	0	2	11	24
		% within metro area	2.9%	8.4%	.0%	6.3%	7.5%	6.3%
	Rick Santorum	Count	0	2	1	0	10	13

		% within metro area	.0%	1.9%	3.3%	.0%	6.8%	3.4%
	Jon Huntsman	Count	4	0	0	0	0	4
		% within metro area	5.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%
	Someone else	Count	7	12	1	2	16	38
		% within metro area	10.3%	11.2%	3.3%	6.3%	10.9%	9.9%
	Don't know	Count	5	17	5	7	19	53
		% within metro area	7.4%	15.9%	16.7%	21.9%	12.9%	13.8%
Total		Count	68	107	30	32	147	384
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	2	4	1	3	2	3	0	15
		% within libcon	6.7%	9.5%	2.6%	2.7%	11.8%	30.0%	.0%	6.0%
Chris Bell Co % Chet Edwards Co	Count	5	5	3	3	2	0	0	18	
	% within libcon	16.7%	11.9%	7.7%	2.7%	11.8%	.0%	.0%	7.1%	
	Count	6	4	5	9	2	0	1	27	
	within libcon	% within libcon	20.0%	9.5%	12.8%	8.1%	11.8%	.0%	33.3%	10.7%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	8	8	4	14	0	0	0	34
		% within libcon	26.7%	19.0%	10.3%	12.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.5%
	Don't know	Count	9	21	26	82	11	7	2	158
		% within libcon	30.0%	50.0%	66.7%	73.9%	64.7%	70.0%	66.7%	62.7%
Total		Count	30	42	39	111	17	10	3	252
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

					7 point Par	ty ID			
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not sure	Total
Democratic senate	John Sharp	Count	5	5	2	2	0	0	14
primary _		% within 7 point Party ID	3.5%	9.1%	6.5%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	5.6%
	Chris Bell	Count	8	5	2	1	1	0	17
		% within 7 point Party ID	5.6%	9.1%	6.5%	7.1%	100.0%	.0%	6.8%
	Chet Edwards	Count	22	3	2	1	0	0	28
		% within 7 point Party ID	15.3%	5.5%	6.5%	7.1%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	23	7	4	0	0	0	34

		% within 7 point Party ID	16.0%	12.7%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.7%
	Don't know	Count	86	35	21	10	0	4	156
		% within 7 point Party ID	59.7%	63.6%	67.7%	71.4%	.0%	100.0%	62.7%
Total		Count	144	55	31	14	1	4	249
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Dellioci	alle senale primary	aye crossi	abulation			
				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	2	3	7	3	15
		% within age	3.8%	5.2%	6.1%	10.7%	5.9%
	Chris Bell	Count	3	5	9	1	18
		% within age	5.8%	8.6%	7.8%	3.6%	7.1%
	Chet Edwards	Count	8	7	11	1	27
		% within age	15.4%	12.1%	9.6%	3.6%	10.7%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	6	8	13	7	34
		% within age	11.5%	13.8%	11.3%	25.0%	13.4%
	Don't know	Count	33	35	75	16	159
		% within age	63.5%	60.3%	65.2%	57.1%	62.8%
Total		Count	52	58	115	28	253
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * age Crosstabulation

Democratic senate primary * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	ı			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Democratic senate	John Sharp	Count	3	7	2	1	1	1	15
primary		% within Education	50.0%	8.1%	2.4%	3.7%	2.9%	6.3%	6.0%
Ch Ch	Chris Bell	Count	0	0	10	2	4	1	17
		% within Education	.0%	.0%	12.0%	7.4%	11.8%	6.3%	6.7%
	Chet Edwards	Count	0	11	11	3	1	2	28
		% within Education	.0%	12.8%	13.3%	11.1%	2.9%	12.5%	11.1%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	1	8	9	5	5	6	34
		% within Education	16.7%	9.3%	10.8%	18.5%	14.7%	37.5%	13.5%
	Don't know	Count	2	60	51	16	23	6	158
		% within Education	33.3%	69.8%	61.4%	59.3%	67.6%	37.5%	62.7%

Total	Count	6	86	83	27	34	16	252
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			<i>y</i>					
				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	3	0	1	7	4	15
		% within Religious attendance	10.3%	.0%	2.9%	10.3%	4.3%	5.9%
	Chris Bell	Count	1	4	3	6	4	18
		% within Religious attendance	3.4%	14.3%	8.6%	8.8%	4.3%	7.1%
	Chet Edwards	Count	6	4	0	7	11	28
		% within Religious attendance	20.7%	14.3%	.0%	10.3%	11.8%	11.1%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	7	3	3	5	15	33
		% within Religious attendance	24.1%	10.7%	8.6%	7.4%	16.1%	13.0%
	Don't know	Count	12	17	28	43	59	159
		% within Religious attendance	41.4%	60.7%	80.0%	63.2%	63.4%	62.8%
Total		Count	29	28	35	68	93	253
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Democratic senate primary * Race Crosstabulation

				Race					
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Mixed	Other	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	9	3	3	0	0	0	15
		% within Race	7.4%	4.3%	5.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.0%
	Chris Bell	Count	11	2	3	1	1	0	18
		% within Race	9.0%	2.9%	5.8%	33.3%	20.0%	.0%	7.1%
	Chet Edwards	Count	15	6	4	0	2	0	27
		% within Race	12.3%	8.7%	7.7%	.0%	40.0%	.0%	10.7%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	14	7	14	0	0	0	35
		% within Race	11.5%	10.1%	26.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	13.9%
	Don't know	Count	73	51	28	2	2	1	157

	% within Race	59.8%	73.9%	53.8%	66.7%	40.0%	100.0%	62.3%
Total	Count	122	69	52	3	5	1	252
	% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Marital Status Domestic Widowed partnership Married Separated Divorced Single Total John Sharp Democratic senate Count 8 0 2 0 4 0 14 primary % within Marital Status 6.5% .0% 4.9% .0% 6.1% .0% 5.6% Chris Bell Count 7 0 3 0 7 1 18 7.2% % within Marital Status 5.7% .0% 7.3% .0% 10.6% 7.1% Chet Edwards Count 9 2 12 2 27 1 1 % within Marital Status 7.3% 50.0% 4.9% 20.0% 18.2% 14.3% 10.8% Ricardo Sanchez Count 19 0 7 1 7 1 35 <u>15</u>.4% 20.0% 10.6% 13.9% % within Marital Status .0% 17.1% 7.1% Don't know 80 27 10 Count 3 36 157 1 65.0% 65.9% 62.5% % within Marital Status 50.0% 60.0% 54.5% 71.4% 14 251 Total Count 123 2 41 5 66 % within Marital Status 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Democratic senate primary * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	7	8	15
		% within Gender	6.9%	5.3%	6.0%
	Chris Bell	Count	8	9	17
		% within Gender	7.9%	6.0%	6.7%
	Chet Edwards Count		15	12	27
		% within Gender	14.9%	7.9%	10.7%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	22	13	35
		% within Gender	21.8%	8.6%	13.9%
	Don't know	Count	49	109	158
		% within Gender	48.5%	72.2%	62.7%
Total		Count	101	151	252

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	7	8	15
		% within Gender	6.9%	5.3%	6.0%
	Chris Bell	Count	8	9	17
		% within Gender	7.9%	6.0%	6.7%
	Chet Edwards Co	Count	15	12	27
		% within Gender	14.9%	7.9%	10.7%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	22	13	35
		% within Gender	21.8%	8.6%	13.9%
	Don't know	Count	49	109	158
		% within Gender	48.5%	72.2%	62.7%
Total		Count	101	151	252
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * Gender Crosstabulation

Democratic senate primary * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	5	6	3	14
		% within urban/suburban/rural	6.2%	4.3%	10.0%	5.6%
	Chris Bell	Count	7	7	4	18
		% within urban/suburban/rural	8.6%	5.1%	13.3%	7.2%
	Chet Edwards	Count	4	22	2	28
		% within urban/suburban/rural	4.9%	15.9%	6.7%	11.2%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	11	19	5	35
		% within urban/suburban/rural	13.6%	13.8%	16.7%	14.1%
	Don't know	Count	54	84	16	154
		% within urban/suburban/rural	66.7%	60.9%	53.3%	61.8%
Total		Count	81	138	30	249
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Democratic senate primary * metro area Crosstabulation

	metro area lotal	
--	------------------	--

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Democratic senate primary	John Sharp	Count	4	3	0	5	4	16
		% within metro area	7.1%	3.6%	.0%	17.9%	6.0%	6.4%
	Chris Bell	Count	6	4	1	2	4	17
		% within metro area	10.7%	4.8%	6.3%	7.1%	6.0%	6.8%
	Chet Edwards	Count	1	13	1	1	11	27
		% within metro area	1.8%	15.7%	6.3%	3.6%	16.4%	10.8%
	Ricardo Sanchez	Count	5	11	1	5	12	34
		% within metro area	8.9%	13.3%	6.3%	17.9%	17.9%	13.6%
	Don't know	Count	40	52	13	15	36	156
		% within metro area	71.4%	62.7%	81.3%	53.6%	53.7%	62.4%
Total		Count	56	83	16	28	67	250
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	0	0	5	43	77	141	113	379
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	8.6%	18.5%	68.8%	86.0%	89.7%	47.7%
	Barack Obama	Count	30	43	44	104	14	4	3	242
		% within libcon	65.2%	76.8%	75.9%	44.8%	12.5%	2.4%	2.4%	30.5%
	Someone else	Count	9	6	5	34	7	16	6	83
		% within libcon	19.6%	10.7%	8.6%	14.7%	6.3%	9.8%	4.8%	10.5%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	7	7	4	51	14	3	4	90
	enough to have an opinion	% within libcon	15.2%	12.5%	6.9%	22.0%	12.5%	1.8%	3.2%	11.3%
Total		Count	46	56	58	232	112	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				ſ
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	2	7	0	25	105	47	187	3	376
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	8.8%	.0%	26.9%	84.0%	72.3%	95.4%	23.1%	47.6%
	Barack Obama	Count	139	40	34	23	0	1	2	1	240
		% within 7 point Party ID	82.7%	50.0%	68.0%	24.7%	.0%	1.5%	1.0%	7.7%	30.4%
	Someone else	Count	6	10	14	27	12	7	5	3	84
		% within 7 point Party ID	3.6%	12.5%	28.0%	29.0%	9.6%	10.8%	2.6%	23.1%	10.6%

	Haven't thought about it	Count	21	23	2	18	8	10	2	6	90
	enough to have an opinion	% within 7 point Party ID	12.5%	28.7%	4.0%	19.4%	6.4%	15.4%	1.0%	46.2%	11.4%
Total		Count	168	80	50	93	125	65	196	13	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		U					
				a	ge		
			age 18-29 30-44 45-64 65 39 111 149 30.0% 51.2% 45.4% 51 62 101 39.2% 28.6% 30.8% 16 19 43 24 25 35 18.5% 11.5% 10.7%	65 & over	Total		
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	39	111	149	82	381
		% within age	30.0%	51.2%	45.4%	65.6%	47.6%
	Barack Obama	Count	51	62	101	28	242
		% within age	39.2%	28.6%	30.8%	22.4%	30.3%
	Someone else	Count	16	19	43	6	84
		% within age	12.3%	8.8%	13.1%	4.8%	10.5%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	24	25	35	9	93
	enough to have an opinion	% within age	18.5%	11.5%	10.7%	7.2%	11.6%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * age Crosstabulation

Presidential vote * Education Crosstabulation

					Education	I			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	15	149	109	38	49	21	381
		% within Education	45.5%	49.5%	45.2%	49.4%	46.2%	47.7%	47.5%
	Barack Obama	Count	1	68	83	26	45	19	242
		% within Education	3.0%	22.6%	34.4%	33.8%	42.5%	43.2%	30.2%
	Someone else	Count	7	32	29	10	5	3	86
		% within Education	21.2%	10.6%	12.0%	13.0%	4.7%	6.8%	10.7%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	10	52	20	3	7	1	93
	enough to have an opinion	% within Education	30.3%	17.3%	8.3%	3.9%	6.6%	2.3%	11.6%
Total		Count	33	301	241	77	106	44	802
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	88	80	36	93	83	380
		% within Religious attendance	64.2%	63.0%	40.9%	42.9%	35.9%	47.5%
	Barack Obama	Count	30	19	31	64	99	243
		% within Religious attendance	21.9%	15.0%	35.2%	29.5%	42.9%	30.4%
	Someone else	Count	12	12	11	25	24	84
		% within Religious attendance	8.8%	9.4%	12.5%	11.5%	10.4%	10.5%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	7	16	10	35	25	93
	enough to have an opinion	% within Religious attendance	5.1%	12.6%	11.4%	16.1%	10.8%	11.6%
Total		Count	137	127	88	217	231	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * Race Crosstabulation

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Race			!	í [,]
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	292	8	50	4	5	5	16	380
		% within Race	57.7%	8.2%	34.7%	40.0%	100.0%	33.3%	66.7%	47.4%
1	Barack Obama	Count	114	69	46	3	0	5	6	243
		% within Race	22.5%	71.1%	31.9%	30.0%	.0%	33.3%	25.0%	30.3%
	Someone else	Count	57	9	15	1'	0	2	2	86
		% within Race	11.3%	9.3%	10.4%	10.0%	.0%	13.3%	8.3%	10.7%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	43	11	33	2	0	3	0	92
	enough to have an opinion	% within Race	8.5%	11.3%	22.9%	20.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	11.5%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Marital Status Total		
	Marital Status	Total

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	262	5	35	19	44	15	380
	·	% within Marital Status	57.1%	41.7%	36.5%	54.3%	28.0%	37.5%	47.6%
	Barack Obama	Count	109	3	39	9	68	14	242
		% within Marital Status	23.7%	25.0%	40.6%	25.7%	43.3%	35.0%	30.3%
	Someone else	Count	41	3	16	2	16	6	84
		% within Marital Status	8.9%	25.0%	16.7%	5.7%	10.2%	15.0%	10.5%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	47	1	6	5	29	5	93
	enough to have an opinion	% within Marital Status	10.2%	8.3%	6.3%	14.3%	18.5%	12.5%	11.6%
Total		Count	459	12	96	35	157	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	205	176	381
		% within Gender	55.0%	41.1%	47.6%
	Barack Obama	Count	106	137	243
		% within Gender	28.4%	32.0%	30.3%
	Someone else	Count	38	46	84
		% within Gender	10.2%	10.7%	10.5%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	24	69	93
	enough to have an opinion	% within Gender	6.4%	16.1%	11.6%
Total		Count	373	428	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	84	176	119	379
		% within urban/suburban/rural	39.3%	45.1%	63.0%	47.8%
	Barack Obama	Count	78	140	24	242
		% within urban/suburban/rural	36.4%	35.9%	12.7%	30.5%
	Someone else	Count	19	43	22	84

		% within urban/suburban/rural	8.9%	11.0%	11.6%	10.6%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	33	31	24	88
	enough to have an opinion	% within urban/suburban/rural	15.4%	7.9%	12.7%	11.1%
Total		Count	214	390	189	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Presidential vote * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Presidential vote	Republican candidate	Count	66	106	31	29	145	377
		% within metro area	42.3%	44.4%	49.2%	41.4%	54.1%	47.4%
	Barack Obama	Count	51	91	15	30	55	242
		% within metro area	32.7%	38.1%	23.8%	42.9%	20.5%	30.4%
	Someone else	Count	22	21	6	3	32	84
		% within metro area	14.1%	8.8%	9.5%	4.3%	11.9%	10.6%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	17	21	11	8	36	93
	enough to have an opinion	% within metro area	10.9%	8.8%	17.5%	11.4%	13.4%	11.7%
Total		Count	156	239	63	70	268	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	0	2	5	35	75	135	113	365
		% within libcon	.0%	3.4%	8.5%	15.3%	67.0%	82.3%	89.7%	46.0%
	Democratic candidate	Count	28	44	40	100	13	7	3	235
		% within libcon	62.2%	75.9%	67.8%	43.7%	11.6%	4.3%	2.4%	29.6%
	Someone else	Count	4	6	4	17	5	7	4	47
		% within libcon	8.9%	10.3%	6.8%	7.4%	4.5%	4.3%	3.2%	5.9%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	13	6	10	77	19	15	6	146
	enough to have an opinion	% within libcon	28.9%	10.3%	16.9%	33.6%	17.0%	9.1%	4.8%	18.4%
Total		Count	45	58	59	229	112	164	126	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	3	6	1	21	101	48	182	2	364
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.8%	7.6%	1.9%	22.8%	81.5%	73.8%	93.8%	16.7%	46.4%
	Democratic candidate	Count	134	46	34	18	0	0	2	0	234
		% within 7 point Party ID	80.7%	58.2%	65.4%	19.6%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	.0%	29.8%
	Someone else	Count	2	4	7	17	8	7	0	4	49
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	5.1%	13.5%	18.5%	6.5%	10.8%	.0%	33.3%	6.3%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	27	23	10	36	15	10	10	6	137
	enough to have an opinion	% within 7 point Party ID	16.3%	29.1%	19.2%	39.1%	12.1%	15.4%	5.2%	50.0%	17.5%
Total		Count	166	79	52	92	124	65	194	12	784
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Senate vote * age Crosstabulation

-				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	34	102	148	83	367
		% within age	26.4%	47.2%	45.3%	66.4%	46.0%
	Democratic candidate	Count	45	63	101	26	235
		% within age		29.2%	30.9%	20.8%	29.5%
	Someone else	Count	9	9	26	5	49
		% within age	7.0%	4.2%	8.0%	4.0%	6.1%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	41	42	52	11	146
	enough to have an opinion	% within age	31.8%	19.4%	15.9%	8.8%	18.3%
Total		Count	129	216	327	125	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * Education Crosstabulation

					Education	1			
	nate vote Republican candidate Count			High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	13	148	102	37	48	19	367

		% within Education	40.6%	49.8%	42.5%	47.4%	45.7%	44.2%	46.2%
	Democratic candidate	Count	4	75	77	24	36	19	235
		% within Education	12.5%	25.3%	32.1%	30.8%	34.3%	44.2%	29.6%
	Someone else	Count	8	13	16	5	3	3	48
		% within Education	25.0%	4.4%	6.7%	6.4%	2.9%	7.0%	6.0%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	7	61	45	12	18	2	145
	enough to have an opinion	% within Education	21.9%	20.5%	18.8%	15.4%	17.1%	4.7%	18.2%
Total		Count	32	297	240	78	105	43	795
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a vear	Never	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	83	78	38	90	79	368
		% within Religious attendance	60.6%	60.9%	43.2%	41.9%	34.2%	46.1%
	Democratic candidate	Count	27	23	26	67	93	236
		% within Religious attendance	19.7%	18.0%	29.5%	31.2%	40.3%	29.5%
	Someone else	Count	8	5	3	14	20	50
		% within Religious attendance	5.8%	3.9%	3.4%	6.5%	8.7%	6.3%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	19	22	21	44	39	145
	enough to have an opinion	% within Religious attendance	13.9%	17.2%	23.9%	20.5%	16.9%	18.1%
Total		Count	137	128	88	215	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * Race Crosstabulation

			Race				
				Native			
				American /			
				Americano			
				indÃ-gena Ã ³			
White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total

Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	279	7	53	3	5	5	16	368
		% within Race	55.5%	7.2%	36.8%	30.0%	100.0%	35.7%	69.6%	46.2%
	Democratic candidate	Count	112	67	46	3	0	4	3	235
		% within Race	22.3%	69.1%	31.9%	30.0%	.0%	28.6%	13.0%	29.5%
	Someone else	Count	32	4	7	2	0	3	1	49
		% within Race	6.4%	4.1%	4.9%	20.0%	.0%	21.4%	4.3%	6.2%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	80	19	38	2	0	2	3	144
	enough to have an opinion	% within Race	15.9%	19.6%	26.4%	20.0%	.0%	14.3%	13.0%	18.1%
Total		Count	503	97	144	10	5	14	23	796
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	248	3	38	20	42	15	366
		% within Marital Status	54.1%	23.1%	39.6%	60.6%	27.1%	38.5%	46.1%
	Democratic candidate	Count	106	5	40	6	65	14	236
		% within Marital Status	23.1%	38.5%	41.7%	18.2%	41.9%	35.9%	29.7%
	Someone else	Count	27	3	4	3	6	5	48
		% within Marital Status	5.9%	23.1%	4.2%	9.1%	3.9%	12.8%	6.0%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	77	2	14	4	42	5	144
	enough to have an opinion	% within Marital Status	16.8%	15.4%	14.6%	12.1%	27.1%	12.8%	18.1%
Total		Count	458	13	96	33	155	39	794
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	199	169	368
		% within Gender	53.8%	39.6%	46.2%
	Democratic candidate	Count	99	136	235
		% within Gender	26.8%	31.9%	29.5%
	Someone else	Count	22	27	49
		% within Gender	5.9%	6.3%	6.1%

	Haven't thought about it	Count	50	95	145
	enough to have an opinion	% within Gender	13.5%	22.2%	18.2%
Total		Count	370	427	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	83	168	115	366
		% within urban/suburban/rural	39.0%	43.2%	61.2%	46.3%
	Democratic candidate	Count	78	131	26	235
		% within urban/suburban/rural	36.6%	33.7%	13.8%	29.7%
	Someone else	Count	12	22	14	48
		% within urban/suburban/rural	5.6%	5.7%	7.4%	6.1%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	40	68	33	141
	enough to have an opinion	% within urban/suburban/rural	18.8%	17.5%	17.6%	17.8%
Total		Count	213	389	188	790
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Senate vote * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort	Yes, I live in the San	Yes, I live in	No, I live in another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Senate vote	Republican candidate	Count	65	98	31	28	141	363
		% within metro area	41.7%	41.0%	48.4%	40.6%	53.2%	45.8%
	Democratic candidate	Count	49	82	14	35	55	235
		% within metro area	31.4%	34.3%	21.9%	50.7%	20.8%	29.6%
	Someone else	Count	13	14	4	1	17	49
		% within metro area	8.3%	5.9%	6.3%	1.4%	6.4%	6.2%
	Haven't thought about it	Count	29	45	15	5	52	146
	enough to have an opinion	% within metro area	18.6%	18.8%	23.4%	7.2%	19.6%	18.4%
Total		Count	156	239	64	69	265	793
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	2	2	5	15	30	38	37	129
		% within libcon	4.3%	3.4%	8.6%	6.6%	26.8%	23.2%	29.4%	16.3%
	Democratic candidate	Count	31	51	47	113	10	5	3	260
		% within libcon	67.4%	87.9%	81.0%	50.0%	8.9%	3.0%	2.4%	32.9%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	2	0	0	22	33	70	58	185
		% within libcon	4.3%	.0%	.0%	9.7%	29.5%	42.7%	46.0%	23.4%
	Don't know	Count	11	5	6	76	39	51	28	216
		% within libcon	23.9%	8.6%	10.3%	33.6%	34.8%	31.1%	22.2%	27.3%
Total		Count	46	58	58	226	112	164	126	790
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * libcon Crosstabulation

Tea party support * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Tea party	Republican candidate	Count	2	6	1	3	14	20	83	0	129
support		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	8.0%	1.9%	3.2%	11.3%	29.9%	42.6%	.0%	16.4%
	Democratic candidate	Count	151	53	42	14	0	0	0	1	261
-		% within 7 point Party ID	89.9%	70.7%	80.8%	15.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	33.2%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	0	1	1	26	78	18	62	0	186
		% within 7 point Party ID	.0%	1.3%	1.9%	28.0%	62.9%	26.9%	31.8%	.0%	23.7%
	Don't know	Count	15	15	8	50	32	29	50	11	210
		% within 7 point Party ID	8.9%	20.0%	15.4%	53.8%	25.8%	43.3%	25.6%	91.7%	26.7%
Total		Count	168	75	52	93	124	67	195	12	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * age Crosstabulation

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	14	47	43	27	131

	-	% within age	11.1%	21.7%	13.1%	21.6%	16.5%
	Democratic candidate	Count	55	61	113	32	261
		% within age	43.7%	28.1%	34.5%	25.6%	32.8%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	22	50	85	30	187
		% within age	17.5%	23.0%	25.9%	24.0%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	35	59	87	36	217
		% within age	27.8%	27.2%	26.5%	28.8%	27.3%
Total		Count	126	217	328	125	796
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * Education Crosstabulation

					Education	1 IIII			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	l otal
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	3	52	36	14	20	6	131
		% within Education	9.4%	17.6%	15.0%	17.9%	18.7%	13.6%	16.5%
	Democratic candidate	Count	6	83	85	26	42	19	261
		% within Education	18.8%	28.1%	35.4%	33.3%	39.3%	43.2%	32.8%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	9	67	59	23	18	11	187
		% within Education	28.1%	22.7%	24.6%	29.5%	16.8%	25.0%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	14	93	60	15	27	8	217
		% within Education	43.8%	31.5%	25.0%	19.2%	25.2%	18.2%	27.3%
Total		Count	32	295	240	78	107	44	796
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Religious attendance						
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total		
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	30	27	17	41	16	131		
		% within Religious attendance	21.7%	21.3%	20.2%	19.0%	6.9%	16.4%		
	Democratic candidate	Count	29	17	29	77	110	262		
		% within Religious attendance	21.0%	13.4%	34.5%	35.6%	47.4%	32.9%		
	Tea Party candidate	Count	41	46	16	36	47	186		

		% within Religious attendance	29.7%	36.2%	19.0%	16.7%	20.3%	23.3%
	Don't know	Count	38	37	22	62	59	218
		% within Religious attendance	27.5%	29.1%	26.2%	28.7%	25.4%	27.4%
Total		Count	138	127	84	216	232	797
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * Race Crosstabulation

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Race				,
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	99	5	21	2	1	0	3	131
		% within Race	19.6%	5.4%	14.6%	20.0%	25.0%	.0%	12.5%	16.5%
	Democratic candidate	Count	125	66	60	3	0	4	3	261
		% within Race	24.7%	71.0%	41.7%	30.0%	.0%	26.7%	12.5%	32.8%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	143	5	24	0	3	4	8	187
		% within Race	28.3%	5.4%	16.7%	.0%	75.0%	26.7%	33.3%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	139	17	39	5	0	7	10	217
		% within Race	27.5%	18.3%	27.1%	50.0%	.0%	46.7%	41.7%	27.3%
Total		Count	506	93	144	10	4	15	24	796
1		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
								Domestic	
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	91	4	15	7	13	2	132
		% within Marital Status	20.0%	30.8%	15.6%	20.0%	8.3%	4.9%	16.6%
	Democratic candidate	Count	120	3	42	10	69	17	261
		% within Marital Status	26.4%	23.1%	43.8%	28.6%	43.9%	41.5%	32.7%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	127	1	12	11	26	10	187
		% within Marital Status	27.9%	7.7%	12.5%	31.4%	16.6%	24.4%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	117	5	27	7	49	12	217
		% within Marital Status	25.7%	38.5%	28.1%	20.0%	31.2%	29.3%	27.2%

Total	Count	455	13	96	35	157	41	797
	% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			Ger	ıder	
			Male	Female	Total
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	58	73	131
		% within Gender	15.6%	17.3%	16.5%
	Democratic candidate	Count	113	147	260
		% within Gender	30.4%	34.8%	32.7%
	Tea Party candidate Count		119	67	186
		% within Gender	32.0%	15.9%	23.4%
	Don't know	Count	82	135	217
		% within Gender	22.0%	32.0%	27.3%
Total		Count	372	422	794
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * Gender Crosstabulation

Tea party support * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	39	55	36	130
		% within urban/suburban/rural	18.1%	14.1%	19.0%	16.4%
	Democratic candidate	Count	90	136	35	261
		% within urban/suburban/rural	41.9%	34.8%	18.5%	32.8%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	35	90	62	187
		% within urban/suburban/rural	16.3%	23.0%	32.8%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	51	110	56	217
		% within urban/suburban/rural	23.7%	28.1%	29.6%	27.3%
Total		Count	215	391	189	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tea party support * metro area Crosstabulation

rou purty s	ouppoir		
		metro area	Total
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Tea party support	Republican candidate	Count	20	43	11	6	52	132
		% within metro area	12.8%	17.9%	17.5%	8.6%	19.8%	16.7%
	Democratic candidate	Count	56	93	16	35	61	261
		% within metro area	35.9%	38.8%	25.4%	50.0%	23.2%	33.0%
	Tea Party candidate	Count	41	42	14	17	68	182
		% within metro area	26.3%	17.5%	22.2%	24.3%	25.9%	23.0%
	Don't know	Count	39	62	22	12	82	217
		% within metro area	25.0%	25.8%	34.9%	17.1%	31.2%	27.4%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	263	792
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas dovt model "lipcon crosstabula	tion
--------------------------------------	------

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	4	0	0	8	20	40	46	118
_		% within libcon	8.5%	.0%	.0%	3.5%	17.9%	24.4%	36.8%	14.9%
	Somewhat agree	Count	4	9	9	58	56	93	62	291
		% within libcon	8.5%	15.8%	15.5%	25.1%	50.0%	56.7%	49.6%	36.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	7	9	17	57	16	12	8	126
		% within libcon	14.9%	15.8%	29.3%	24.7%	14.3%	7.3%	6.4%	15.9%
	Strongly disagree	Count	27	33	28	51	7	7	2	155
		% within libcon	57.4%	57.9%	48.3%	22.1%	6.3%	4.3%	1.6%	19.5%
	Don't know	Count	5	6	4	57	13	12	7	104
		% within libcon	10.6%	10.5%	6.9%	24.7%	11.6%	7.3%	5.6%	13.1%
Total		Count	47	57	58	231	112	164	125	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

					7 point Pa	arty ID				
		Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
_	-	Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not Sule	TOLAI
Texas govt model Strongly agree	Count	7	4	3	3	28	6	66	2	119
	% within 7 point Party ID	4.2%	5.0%	5.9%	3.2%	22.6%	9.1%	33.7%	16.7%	15.1%

	Somewhat agree	Count % within 7 point Party ID	21 12.6%	16 20.0%	5 9.8%	35 37.6%	77 62.1%	30 45.5%	102 52.0%	1 8.3%	287 36.4%
	Somewhat disagree	Count % within 7 point Party ID	45 26.9%	17 21.3%	10 19.6%	17 18.3%	14 11.3%	15 22.7%	7 3.6%	1 8.3%	126 16.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count % within 7 point Party ID	67 40.1%	26 32.5%	28 54.9%	18 19.4%	1 .8%	7 10.6%	4 2.0%	1 8.3%	152 19.3%
	Don't know	Count % within 7 point Party ID	27 16.2%	17 21.3%	5 9.8%	20 21.5%	4 3.2%	8 12.1%	17 8.7%	7 58.3%	105 13.3%
Total		Count % within 7 point Party ID	167 100.0%	80 100.0%	51 100.0%	93 100.0%	124 100.0%	66 100.0%	196 100.0%	12 100.0%	789 100.0%

Texas govt model * age Crosstabulation age 18-29 30-44 45-64 65 & over Total Texas govt model Strongly agree Count 17 32 47 25 121 % within age 12.9% 14.8% 14.4% 20.0% 15.1% Somewhat agree Count 34 82 120 55 291 % within age 25.8% 38.0% 36.7% 44.0% 36.4% Somewhat disagree Count 56 129 20 38 15 % within age 15.2% 17.6% 17.1% 12.0% 16.1% Strongly disagree 25 155 Count 40 73 17 % within age 18.9% 18.5% 22.3% 13.6% 19.4% Don't know Count 36 13 104 24 31 % within age 27.3% 11.1% 9.5% 10.4% 13.0% 216 Total Count 132 327 125 800 % within age 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Texas govt model * Education Crosstabulation

					Education	า			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	6	50	31	11	17	7	122
		% within Education	18.2%	16.7%	12.9%	14.1%	16.0%	15.9%	15.2%
	Somewhat agree	Count	13	111	92	32	33	11	292

		% within Education	39.4%	37.0%	38.3%	41.0%	31.1%	25.0%	36.5%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	3	51	37	9	19	9	128
		% within Education	9.1%	17.0%	15.4%	11.5%	17.9%	20.5%	16.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	5	33	53	22	27	15	155
		% within Education	15.2%	11.0%	22.1%	28.2%	25.5%	34.1%	19.4%
	Don't know	Count	6	55	27	4	10	2	104
		% within Education	18.2%	18.3%	11.3%	5.1%	9.4%	4.5%	13.0%
Total		Count	33	300	240	78	106	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than		A few times a	Once or twice		
			once a week	Once a week	month	a year	Never	Total
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	32	19	15	33	21	120
		% within Religious attendance	23.4%	15.0%	17.2%	15.2%	9.1%	15.0%
	Somewhat agree	Count	55	57	26	84	70	292
		% within Religious attendance	40.1%	44.9%	29.9%	38.7%	30.3%	36.5%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	21	16	16	29	46	128
		% within Religious attendance	15.3%	12.6%	18.4%	13.4%	19.9%	16.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	12	19	19	40	65	155
		% within Religious attendance	8.8%	15.0%	21.8%	18.4%	28.1%	19.4%
	Don't know	Count	17	16	11	31	29	104
		% within Religious attendance	12.4%	12.6%	12.6%	14.3%	12.6%	13.0%
Total		Count	137	127	87	217	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * Race Crosstabulation

Jerra gerrandael indee er eestaalanen	
Race	Total
	-

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	85	5	23	1	0	1	5	120
		% within Race	16.8%	5.2%	16.0%	11.1%	.0%	6.7%	20.8%	15.0%
	Somewhat agree	Count	202	21	48	2	4	4	11	292
		% within Race	40.0%	21.6%	33.3%	22.2%	80.0%	26.7%	45.8%	36.5%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	71	24	24	3	1	6	0	129
		% within Race	14.1%	24.7%	16.7%	33.3%	20.0%	40.0%	.0%	16.1%
	Strongly disagree	Count	88	28	26	3	0	4	5	154
		% within Race	17.4%	28.9%	18.1%	33.3%	.0%	26.7%	20.8%	19.3%
	Don't know	Count	59	19	23	0	0	0	3	104
		% within Race	11.7%	19.6%	16.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	13.0%
Total		Count	505	97	144	9	5	15	24	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	85	2	9	6	12	6	120
		% within Marital Status	18.6%	16.7%	9.4%	17.1%	7.7%	15.4%	15.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	180	6	34	14	44	12	290
		% within Marital Status	39.3%	50.0%	35.4%	40.0%	28.2%	30.8%	36.4%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	67	3	21	6	24	7	128
		% within Marital Status	14.6%	25.0%	21.9%	17.1%	15.4%	17.9%	16.1%
	Strongly disagree	Count	76	1	22	6	38	12	155
		% within Marital Status	16.6%	8.3%	22.9%	17.1%	24.4%	30.8%	19.5%
	Don't know	Count	50	0	10	3	38	2	103
		% within Marital Status	10.9%	.0%	10.4%	8.6%	24.4%	5.1%	12.9%
Total		Count	458	12	96	35	156	39	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	65	56	121
		% within Gender	17.5%	13.1%	15.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	156	136	292
		% within Gender	41.9%	31.9%	36.5%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	54	74	128
		% within Gender	14.5%	17.3%	16.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	73	82	155
		% within Gender	19.6%	19.2%	19.4%
	Don't know	Count	24	79	103
		% within Gender	6.5%	18.5%	12.9%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

-			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	36	47	38	121
		% within urban/suburban/rural	16.8%	12.1%	20.1%	15.3%
	Somewhat agree	Count	72	141	77	290
		% within urban/suburban/rural	33.6%	36.2%	40.7%	36.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	25	77	26	128
		% within urban/suburban/rural	11.7%	19.8%	13.8%	16.2%
	Strongly disagree	Count	54	80	20	154
		% within urban/suburban/rural	25.2%	20.6%	10.6%	19.4%
	Don't know	Count	27	44	28	99
		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.6%	11.3%	14.8%	12.5%
Total		Count	214	389	189	792
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Texas govt model * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Texas govt model	Strongly agree	Count	22	26	9	10	53	120
		% within metro area	14.1%	10.8%	14.3%	14.3%	19.8%	15.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	52	79	27	27	103	288
		% within metro area	33.3%	32.9%	42.9%	38.6%	38.4%	36.1%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	25	48	11	11	34	129
		% within metro area	16.0%	20.0%	17.5%	15.7%	12.7%	16.2%
	Strongly disagree	Count	38	59	8	18	32	155
		% within metro area	24.4%	24.6%	12.7%	25.7%	11.9%	19.4%
	Don't know	Count	19	28	8	4	46	105
		% within metro area	12.2%	11.7%	12.7%	5.7%	17.2%	13.2%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Sonogram	Strongly support	Count	10	1	9	39	44	90	96	289
bill		% within libcon	21.7%	1.8%	15.3%	16.8%	39.3%	54.9%	76.8%	36.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	2	7	5	28	12	40	12	106
		% within libcon	4.3%	12.3%	8.5%	12.1%	10.7%	24.4%	9.6%	13.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	2	6	10	34	10	12	8	82
l		% within libcon	4.3%	10.5%	16.9%	14.7%	8.9%	7.3%	6.4%	10.3%
l	Strongly oppose	Count	32	36	33	78	33	11	5	228
l		% within libcon	69.6%	63.2%	55.9%	33.6%	29.5%	6.7%	4.0%	28.7%
l	Don't know	Count	0	7	2	53	13	11	4	90
		% within libcon	.0%	12.3%	3.4%	22.8%	11.6%	6.7%	3.2%	11.3%
Total		Count	46	57	59	232	112	164	125	795
1		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

otobulati -

Sonogram bill " 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation							
	7 point Party ID	Total					

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Sonogram	Strongly support	Count	20	13	5	22	71	27	127	0	285
bill		% within 7 point Party ID	12.0%	16.3%	9.6%	23.9%	56.8%	41.5%	65.1%	.0%	36.2%
	Somewhat support	Count	11	12	4	19	26	11	23	1	107
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.6%	15.0%	7.7%	20.7%	20.8%	16.9%	11.8%	8.3%	13.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	22	14	6	7	10	8	11	1	79
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.2%	17.5%	11.5%	7.6%	8.0%	12.3%	5.6%	8.3%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	89	25	34	33	11	14	17	3	226
		% within 7 point Party ID	53.3%	31.3%	65.4%	35.9%	8.8%	21.5%	8.7%	25.0%	28.7%
	Don't know	Count	25	16	3	11	7	5	17	7	91
		% within 7 point Party ID	15.0%	20.0%	5.8%	12.0%	5.6%	7.7%	8.7%	58.3%	11.5%
Total		Count	167	80	52	92	125	65	195	12	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	38	91	100	60	289
		% within age	29.0%	41.7%	30.5%	48.4%	36.1%
	Somewhat support	Count	18	22	47	23	110
		% within age	13.7%	10.1%	14.3%	18.5%	13.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	19	16	32	13	80
		% within age	14.5%	7.3%	9.8%	10.5%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	30	64	118	19	231
		% within age	22.9%	29.4%	36.0%	15.3%	28.8%
	Don't know	Count	26	25	31	9	91
		% within age	19.8%	11.5%	9.5%	7.3%	11.4%
Total		Count	131	218	328	124	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	16	116	87	25	32	12	288
		% within Education	50.0%	38.7%	36.4%	32.5%	30.2%	27.3%	36.1%

	Somewhat support	Count	7	44	29	10	13	6	109
		% within Education	21.9%	14.7%	12.1%	13.0%	12.3%	13.6%	13.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	3	32	16	8	17	4	80
		% within Education	9.4%	10.7%	6.7%	10.4%	16.0%	9.1%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	3	72	74	27	36	18	230
		% within Education	9.4%	24.0%	31.0%	35.1%	34.0%	40.9%	28.8%
	Don't know	Count	3	36	33	7	8	4	91
		% within Education	9.4%	12.0%	13.8%	9.1%	7.5%	9.1%	11.4%
Total		Count	32	300	239	77	106	44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	90	60	28	67	43	288
		% within Religious attendance	64.7%	48.0%	31.8%	31.0%	18.5%	36.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	15	18	16	29	32	110
		% within Religious attendance	10.8%	14.4%	18.2%	13.4%	13.8%	13.8%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	18	9	6	23	24	80
		% within Religious attendance	12.9%	7.2%	6.8%	10.6%	10.3%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	11	20	21	65	114	231
		% within Religious attendance	7.9%	16.0%	23.9%	30.1%	49.1%	28.9%
	Don't know	Count	5	18	17	32	19	91
		% within Religious attendance	3.6%	14.4%	19.3%	14.8%	8.2%	11.4%
Total		Count	139	125	88	216	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total					

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	
Sonogram	Strongly support	Count	190	16	58	4	3	3	15	289
bill		% within Race	37.5%	16.5%	40.3%	40.0%	75.0%	21.4%	62.5%	36.2%
	Somewhat support	Count	78	11	15	2	0	0	3	109
		% within Race	15.4%	11.3%	10.4%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	13.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	43	13	18	0	0	3	3	80
		% within Race	8.5%	13.4%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	21.4%	12.5%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	146	38	33	4	1	6	2	230
		% within Race	28.9%	39.2%	22.9%	40.0%	25.0%	42.9%	8.3%	28.8%
	Don't know	Count	49	19	20	0	0	2	1	91
		% within Race	9.7%	19.6%	13.9%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	4.2%	11.4%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	4	14	24	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	185	6	35	13	38	11	288
		% within Marital Status	40.3%	50.0%	36.1%	36.1%	24.4%	27.5%	36.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	72	0	10	8	15	4	109
		% within Marital Status	15.7%	.0%	10.3%	22.2%	9.6%	10.0%	13.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	39	1	7	2	26	5	80
		% within Marital Status	8.5%	8.3%	7.2%	5.6%	16.7%	12.5%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	111	3	42	11	45	20	232
		% within Marital Status	24.2%	25.0%	43.3%	30.6%	28.8%	50.0%	29.0%
	Don't know	Count	52	2	3	2	32	0	91
		% within Marital Status	11.3%	16.7%	3.1%	5.6%	20.5%	.0%	11.4%
Total		Count	459	12	97	36	156	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	145	143	288
		% within Gender	39.0%	33.5%	36.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	55	55	110
		% within Gender	14.8%	12.9%	13.8%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	32	48	80
		% within Gender	8.6%	11.2%	10.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	105	125	230
		% within Gender	28.2%	29.3%	28.8%
	Don't know	Count	35	56	91
		% within Gender	9.4%	13.1%	11.4%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	74	117	96	287
		% within urban/suburban/rural	34.4%	29.9%	50.5%	36.1%
	Somewhat support	Count	21	59	30	110
		% within urban/suburban/rural	9.8%	15.1%	15.8%	13.8%
	Somewhat oppose	ppose Count		46	13	81
		% within urban/suburban/rural	10.2%	11.8%	6.8%	10.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	68	132	31	231
		% within urban/suburban/rural	31.6%	33.8%	16.3%	29.0%
	Don't know	Count	30	37	20	87
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.0%	9.5%	10.5%	10.9%
Total		Count	215	391	190	796
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sonogram bill * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Sonogram bill	Strongly support	Count	48	71	21	12	133	285
		% within metro area	31.0%	29.7%	32.8%	17.4%	49.6%	35.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	22	37	6	7	37	109
		% within metro area	14.2%	15.5%	9.4%	10.1%	13.8%	13.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	17	12	6	11	34	80
		% within metro area	11.0%	5.0%	9.4%	15.9%	12.7%	10.1%
	Strongly oppose	Count	49	89	21	35	36	230
		% within metro area	31.6%	37.2%	32.8%	50.7%	13.4%	28.9%
	Don't know	Count	19	30	10	4	28	91
		% within metro area	12.3%	12.6%	15.6%	5.8%	10.4%	11.4%
Total		Count	155	239	64	69	268	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * libcon Crosstabulation

				libcon								
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total		
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	36	46	30	98	21	10	3	244		
	have the right to marry	% within libcon	78.3%	80.7%	51.7%	42.4%	19.1%	6.1%	2.4%	30.8%		
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	0	5	18	54	46	76	39	238		
	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within libcon	.0%	8.8%	31.0%	23.4%	41.8%	46.1%	31.0%	30.0%		
	Gays and lesbians should not have the right to civil unions or marriage	Count	6	2	8	52	40	77	79	264		
		% within libcon	13.0%	3.5%	13.8%	22.5%	36.4%	46.7%	62.7%	33.3%		
	Don't know	Count	4	4	2	27	3	2	5	47		
		% within libcon	8.7%	7.0%	3.4%	11.7%	2.7%	1.2%	4.0%	5.9%		
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	110	165	126	793		
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Same Sex marriage * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

				7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total	
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	81	39	35	38	13	16	12	2	236	
	have the right to marry	% within 7 point Party ID	48.5%	48.1%	68.6%	40.9%	10.6%	24.6%	6.2%	16.7%	30.0%	
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	31	18	10	22	61	25	72	3	242	

	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within 7 point Party ID	18.6%	22.2%	19.6%	23.7%	49.6%	38.5%	36.9%	25.0%	30.7%
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	38	19	5	23	44	23	107	2	261
	not have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within 7 point Party ID	22.8%	23.5%	9.8%	24.7%	35.8%	35.4%	54.9%	16.7%	33.2%
	Don't know	Count	17	5	1	10	5	1	4	5	48
		% within 7 point Party ID	10.2%	6.2%	2.0%	10.8%	4.1%	1.5%	2.1%	41.7%	6.1%
Total		Count	167	81	51	93	123	65	195	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	65	83	77	18	243
	have the right to marry	% within age	50.8%	38.1%	23.5%	14.3%	30.4%
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	31	49	117	47	244
	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within age	24.2%	22.5%	35.7%	37.3%	30.5%
	Gays and lesbians should not	Count	17	79	118	51	265
	have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within age	13.3%	36.2%	36.0%	40.5%	33.1%
	Don't know	Count	15	7	16	10	48
		% within age	11.7%	3.2%	4.9%	7.9%	6.0%
Total		Count	128	218	328	126	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * Education Crosstabulation

				Education								
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total			
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	5	75	84	29	38	11	242			
	have the right to marry	% within Education	15.2%	25.0%	35.3%	37.7%	35.8%	25.0%	30.3%			
	Gays and lesbians should have the right to civil unions but not marriage	Count	7	106	61	24	29	17	244			
		% within Education	21.2%	35.3%	25.6%	31.2%	27.4%	38.6%	30.6%			
	Gays and lesbians should not have the right to civil unions or marriage	Count	21	94	81	22	34	13	265			
		% within Education	63.6%	31.3%	34.0%	28.6%	32.1%	29.5%	33.2%			
	Don't know	Count	0	25	12	2	5	3	47			
		% within Education	.0%	8.3%	5.0%	2.6%	4.7%	6.8%	5.9%			
Total		Count	33	300	238	77	106	44	798			
					Education							
-------------------	---	--------------------	--------	----------------------	--------------	--------	--------	-----------	--------			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total			
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	5	75	84	29	38	11	242			
	have the right to marry	% within Education	15.2%	25.0%	35.3%	37.7%	35.8%	25.0%	30.3%			
_ (1	Gays and lesbians should	Count	7	106	61	24	29	17	244			
-	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within Education	21.2%	35.3%	25.6%	31.2%	27.4%	38.6%	30.6%			
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	21	94	81	22	34	13	265			
	not have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within Education	63.6%	31.3%	34.0%	28.6%	32.1%	29.5%	33.2%			
	Don't know	Count	0	25	12	2	5	3	47			
		% within Education	.0%	8.3%	5.0%	2.6%	4.7%	6.8%	5.9%			
Total		Count	33	300	238	77	106	44	798			
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Same Sex marriage * Education Crosstabulation

Same Sex marriage * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	12	18	22	70	120	242
	have the right to marry	% within Religious attendance	8.7%	14.4%	24.7%	32.4%	51.9%	30.3%
	Gays and lesbians should	bians should Count t to civil unions % within Religious		41	36	75	58	245
	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within Religious attendance	25.4%	32.8%	40.4%	34.7%	25.1%	30.7%
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	87	62	23	55	38	265
	not have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within Religious attendance	63.0%	49.6%	25.8%	25.5%	16.5%	33.2%
	Don't know	Count	4	4	8	16	15	47
		% within Religious attendance	2.9%	3.2%	9.0%	7.4%	6.5%	5.9%
Total		Count	138	125	89	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * Race Crosstabulation

Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	155	23	51	6	0	3	5	243
	have the right to marry	% within Race	30.8%	23.7%	35.4%	60.0%	.0%	20.0%	21.7%	30.5%
G h b	Gays and lesbians should have the right to civil unions but not marriage	Count	163	22	45	1	1	8	4	244
		% within Race	32.3%	22.7%	31.3%	10.0%	20.0%	53.3%	17.4%	30.6%
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	167	42	34	3	1	4	14	265
	not have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within Race	33.1%	43.3%	23.6%	30.0%	20.0%	26.7%	60.9%	33.2%
	Don't know	Count	19	10	14	0	3	0	0	46
		% within Race	3.8%	10.3%	9.7%	.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%	5.8%
Total		Count	504	97	144	10	5	15	23	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	110	3	29	6	67	27	242
	have the right to marry	% within Marital Status	24.0%	25.0%	29.9%	17.6%	43.5%	67.5%	30.4%
	Gays and lesbians should	Count	155	5	31	10	40	2	243
have t but no	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within Marital Status	33.8%	41.7%	32.0%	29.4%	26.0%	5.0%	30.5%
1	Gays and lesbians should	Count	173	4	34	18	28	7	264
	not have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within Marital Status	37.7%	33.3%	35.1%	52.9%	18.2%	17.5%	33.2%
i	Don't know	Count	21	0	3	0	19	4	47
l		% within Marital Status	4.6%	.0%	3.1%	.0%	12.3%	10.0%	5.9%
Total		Count	459	12	97	34	154	40	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	94	149	243
	have the right to marry	% within Gender	25.4%	34.8%	30.5%

	Gays and lesbians should have the right to civil unions but not marriage	Count % within Gender	128 34.6%	116 27.1%	244 30.6%
	Gays and lesbians should not have the right to civil unions or marriage	Count % within Gender	129 34.9%	135 31.5%	264 33.1%
	Don't know	Count % within Gender	19 5.1%	28 6.5%	47 5.9%
Total		Count	370	428	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Same Sex marriage	Gays and lesbians should	Count	64	140	38	242
	have the right to marry	% within urban/suburban/rural	30.0%	35.8%	20.1%	30.5%
	Gays and lesbians should Control Revealed Control Control Revealed Control Control Revealed Control Co	Count	64	124	51	239
	have the right to civil unions % but not marriage	% within urban/suburban/rural	30.0%	31.7%	27.0%	30.1%
	Gays and lesbians should not	Count	67	113	84	264
	have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within urban/suburban/rural	31.5%	28.9%	44.4%	33.3%
	Don't know	Count	18	14	16	48
		% within urban/suburban/rural	8.5%	3.6%	8.5%	6.1%
Total		Count	213	391	189	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Same Sex marriage * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area		<u> </u>	í'
				Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	1 '
			Yes, I live in the	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	1 '
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Same Sex marriage Ga	Gays and lesbians should have the right to marry	Count	48	89	22	24	59	242
		% within metro area	30.8%	37.2%	34.9%	34.3%	22.1%	30.4%
1	Gays and lesbians should	Count	51	65	23	26	76	241
	have the right to civil unions but not marriage	% within metro area	32.7%	27.2%	36.5%	37.1%	28.5%	30.3%
1	Gays and lesbians should	Count	48	73	12	20	112	265

	not have the right to civil unions or marriage	% within metro area	30.8%	30.5%	19.0%	28.6%	41.9%	33.3%
	Don't know	Count	9	12	6	0	20	47
		% within metro area	5.8%	5.0%	9.5%	.0%	7.5%	5.9%
Total		Count	156	239	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
State revenue	It should be increased to	Count	33	43	43	116	32	42	25	334
for education	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within libcon	71.7%	76.8%	74.1%	50.2%	28.8%	25.5%	20.0%	42.2%
	It should be increased to	Count	6	7	8	34	12	14	8	89
m m tt	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans It should stay the same	% within libcon	13.0%	12.5%	13.8%	14.7%	10.8%	8.5%	6.4%	11.2%
	It should stay the same	Count	0	4	3	27	24	48	36	142
		% within libcon	.0%	7.1%	5.2%	11.7%	21.6%	29.1%	28.8%	17.9%
	It should be decreased	Count	0	0	1	15	19	39	41	115
		% within libcon	.0%	.0%	1.7%	6.5%	17.1%	23.6%	32.8%	14.5%
	Don't know	Count	7	2	3	39	24	22	15	112
		% within libcon	15.2%	3.6%	5.2%	16.9%	21.6%	13.3%	12.0%	14.1%
Total		Count	46	56	58	231	111	165	125	792
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
State revenue for	It should be increased to	Count	109	45	39	37	22	26	50	2	330
education m a lt m a n	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within 7 point Party ID	65.3%	56.3%	76.5%	40.2%	17.7%	38.8%	25.8%	15.4%	41.9%
	It should be increased to	Count	16	13	5	15	10	10	19	2	90
	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within 7 point Party ID	9.6%	16.3%	9.8%	16.3%	8.1%	14.9%	9.8%	15.4%	11.4%
	It should stay the same	Count	17	9	3	11	26	10	63	2	141
		% within 7 point Party ID	10.2%	11.3%	5.9%	12.0%	21.0%	14.9%	32.5%	15.4%	17.9%
lt	It should be decreased	Count	7	3	1	14	45	7	39	0	116
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.2%	3.8%	2.0%	15.2%	36.3%	10.4%	20.1%	.0%	14.7%
	Don't know	Count	18	10	3	15	21	14	23	7	111

	% within 7 point Party ID	10.8%	12.5%	5.9%	16.3%	16.9%	20.9%	11.9%	53.8%	14.1%
Total	Count	167	80	51	92	124	67	194	13	788
	% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
State revenue for	It should be increased to make	Count	66	89	138	45	338
education	college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within age	50.8%	41.0%	42.2%	36.0%	42.3%
	It should be increased to make	Count	16	21	37	15	89
	college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within age	12.3%	9.7%	11.3%	12.0%	11.1%
	It should stay the same	Count	12	40	55	35	142
		% within age	9.2%	18.4%	16.8%	28.0%	17.8%
	It should be decreased	Count	13	34	53	16	116
		% within age	10.0%	15.7%	16.2%	12.8%	14.5%
	Don't know	Count	23	33	44	14	114
		% within age	17.7%	15.2%	13.5%	11.2%	14.3%
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * age Crosstabulation

State revenue for education * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	า			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
State revenue	It should be increased to	Count	10	113	111	34	50	19	337
for education	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within Education	31.3%	37.7%	46.4%	44.2%	47.2%	44.2%	42.3%
	It should be increased to	Count	2	37	27	9	11	4	90
	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within Education	6.3%	12.3%	11.3%	11.7%	10.4%	9.3%	11.3%
	It should stay the same	Count	6	57	32	16	24	6	141
		% within Education	18.8%	19.0%	13.4%	20.8%	22.6%	14.0%	17.7%
	It should be decreased	Count	8	39	35	13	12	9	116

		% within Education	25.0%	13.0%	14.6%	16.9%	11.3%	20.9%	14.6%
	Don't know	Count	6	54	34	5	9	5	113
		% within Education	18.8%	18.0%	14.2%	6.5%	8.5%	11.6%	14.2%
Total		Count	32	300	239	77	106	43	797
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		Oldie Toronido for oddodno	II Rongieue au		Jubulution			
I				Reli	gious attendance	,	!	1 7
			More than	1	A few times a	Once or twice	1 !	1 7
			once a week	Once a week	month	a year	Never	Total
State revenue	It should be increased to	Count	43	44	35	96	120	338
for education	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within Religious attendance	31.2%	34.9%	39.3%	44.7%	51.9%	42.3%
	It should be increased to	Count	17	13	14	29	17	90
	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within Religious attendance	12.3%	10.3%	15.7%	13.5%	7.4%	11.3%
	It should stay the same	Count	35	34	13	30	30	142
		% within Religious attendance	25.4%	27.0%	14.6%	14.0%	13.0%	17.8%
	It should be decreased	Count	24	20	12	32	27	115
		% within Religious att <u>endance</u>	17.4%	15.9%	13.5%	14.9%	11.7%	14.4%
l	Don't know	Count	19	15	15	28	37	114
		% within Religious attendance	13.8%	11.9%	16.9%	13.0%	16.0%	14.3%
Total		Count	138	126	89	215	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

State revenue for education * Race Crosstabulation

			Race				
White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Total

State revenue for	It should be increased to	Count	199	54	65	3	0	10	7	338
education	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within Race	39.3%	56.3%	45.5%	33.3%	.0%	71.4%	28.0%	42.4%
	It should be increased to	Count	50	12	22	2	0	1	2	89
	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within Race	9.9%	12.5%	15.4%	22.2%	.0%	7.1%	8.0%	11.2%
	It should stay the same	Count	107	9	20	1	0	1	4	142
		% within Race	21.1%	9.4%	14.0%	11.1%	.0%	7.1%	16.0%	17.8%
	It should be decreased	Count	75	8	17	1	4	1	9	115
		% within Race	14.8%	8.3%	11.9%	11.1%	100.0%	7.1%	36.0%	14.4%
	Don't know	Count	75	13	19	2	0	1	3	113
		% within Race	14.8%	13.5%	13.3%	22.2%	.0%	7.1%	12.0%	14.2%
Total		Count	506	96	143	9	4	14	25	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
State revenue	It should be increased to	Count	174	4	51	14	75	20	338
for education	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within Marital Status	38.0%	30.8%	52.6%	40.0%	47.8%	50.0%	42.3%
	It should be increased to	Count	46	3	14	5	17	5	90
	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within Marital Status	10.0%	23.1%	14.4%	14.3%	10.8%	12.5%	11.3%
	It should stay the same	Count	97	3	14	8	15	7	144
		% within Marital Status	21.2%	23.1%	14.4%	22.9%	9.6%	17.5%	18.0%
	It should be decreased	Count	79	1	7	4	22	2	115
		% within Marital Status	17.2%	7.7%	7.2%	11.4%	14.0%	5.0%	14.4%
	Don't know	Count	62	2	11	4	28	6	113
		% within Marital Status	13.5%	15.4%	11.3%	11.4%	17.8%	15.0%	14.1%
Total		Count	458	13	97	35	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gen	der	
			Male	Female	Total
State revenue for	It should be increased to make	Count	140	197	337
education	college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within Gender	37.6%	46.1%	42.2%
	It should be increased to make	Count	36	55	91
	college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within Gender	9.7%	12.9%	11.4%
	It should stay the same	Count	66	76	142
		% within Gender	17.7%	17.8%	17.8%
	It should be decreased	Count	82	34	116
		% within Gender	22.0%	8.0%	14.5%
	Don't know	Count	48	65	113
		% within Gender	12.9%	15.2%	14.1%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
State revenue for	It should be increased to make	Count	92	188	58	338
education	college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within urban/suburban/rural	43.0%	48.3%	30.5%	42.6%
	It should be increased to make	Count	34	34	22	90
	college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within urban/suburban/rural	15.9%	8.7%	11.6%	11.3%
	It should stay the same	Count	35	66	40	141
		% within urban/suburban/rural	16.4%	17.0%	21.1%	17.8%
	It should be decreased	Count	22	50	43	115
		% within urban/suburban/rural	10.3%	12.9%	22.6%	14.5%
	Don't know	Count	31	51	27	109
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.5%	13.1%	14.2%	13.7%
Total		Count	214	389	190	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
State revenue for	It should be increased to	Count	64	125	28	31	88	336
education	make college education more affordable for all Texans.	% within metro area	41.3%	52.3%	44.4%	44.3%	32.8%	42.3%
	It should be increased to	Count	25	19	5	10	31	90
	make college education more affordable for only the most needy Texans	% within metro area	16.1%	7.9%	7.9%	14.3%	11.6%	11.3%
	It should stay the same	Count	21	36	14	14	57	142
		% within metro area	13.5%	15.1%	22.2%	20.0%	21.3%	17.9%
	It should be decreased	Count	28	23	10	8	43	112
		% within metro area	18.1%	9.6%	15.9%	11.4%	16.0%	14.1%
	Don't know	Count	17	36	6	7	49	115
		% within metro area	11.0%	15.1%	9.5%	10.0%	18.3%	14.5%
Total		Count	155	239	63	70	268	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

State revenue for education * metro area Crosstabulation

Redistricting * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	37	37	42	83	47	43	25	314
		% within libcon	80.4%	64.9%	72.4%	35.9%	42.0%	26.2%	19.8%	39.5%
	Oppose	Count	2	2	6	48	35	79	71	243
		% within libcon	4.3%	3.5%	10.3%	20.8%	31.3%	48.2%	56.3%	30.6%
	Don't know	Count	7	18	10	100	30	42	30	237
		% within libcon	15.2%	31.6%	17.2%	43.3%	26.8%	25.6%	23.8%	29.8%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID										
			Strong	Not very strong			Lean	Not very strong	Strong		1
			Democrat	Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	91	40	38	40	33	27	38	2	309
		% within 7 point Party ID	54.2%	50.0%	74.5%	43.5%	26.6%	40.9%	19.5%	15.4%	39.2%

	Oppose	Count	20	8	3	20	70	21	96	4	242
		% within 7 point Party ID	11.9%	10.0%	5.9%	21.7%	56.5%	31.8%	49.2%	30.8%	30.7%
	Don't know	Count	57	32	10	32	21	18	61	7	238
		% within 7 point Party ID	33.9%	40.0%	19.6%	34.8%	16.9%	27.3%	31.3%	53.8%	30.2%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	124	66	195	13	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * age Crosstabulation

-				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	49	96	128	43	316
		% within age	37.4%	44.2%	39.1%	34.7%	39.5%
	Oppose	Count	32	61	97	52	242
		% within age	24.4%	28.1%	29.7%	41.9%	30.3%
	Don't know	Count	50	60	102	29	241
		% within age	38.2%	27.6%	31.2%	23.4%	30.2%
Total		Count	131	217	327	124	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	1			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	7	111	98	34	46	20	316
		% within Education	21.9%	36.9%	41.0%	44.2%	43.4%	46.5%	39.6%
	Oppose	Count	12	89	68	27	30	16	242
		% within Education	37.5%	29.6%	28.5%	35.1%	28.3%	37.2%	30.3%
	Don't know	Count	13	101	73	16	30	7	240
		% within Education	40.6%	33.6%	30.5%	20.8%	28.3%	16.3%	30.1%
Total		Count	32	301	239	77	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

, · J · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Religious attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Redistricting	Favor	Count % within Religious attendance	44 31.7%	38 30.2%	34 38.2%	86 39.8%	114 49.4%	316 39.5%
	Oppose	Count % within Religious attendance	54 38.8%	55 43.7%	18 20.2%	65 30.1%	52 22.5%	244 30.5%
	Don't know	Count % within Religious attendance	41 29.5%	33 26.2%	37 41.6%	65 30.1%	65 28.1%	241 30.1%
Total		Count % within Religious attendance	139 100.0%	126 100.0%	89 100.0%	216 100.0%	231 100.0%	801 100.0%

Redistricting * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	181	36	74	7	0	11	8	317
		% within Race	35.7%	37.1%	51.4%	70.0%	.0%	73.3%	33.3%	39.6%
	Oppose	Count	170	21	33	1	3	4	11	243
		% within Race	33.5%	21.6%	22.9%	10.0%	75.0%	26.7%	45.8%	30.3%
	Don't know	Count	156	40	37	2	1	0	5	241
		% within Race	30.8%	41.2%	25.7%	20.0%	25.0%	.0%	20.8%	30.1%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	4	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	Marital Status					
	Domestic					
Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total

Redistricting	Favor	Count	157	1	54	19	63	22	316
		% within Marital Status	34.2%	8.3%	56.3%	54.3%	40.1%	55.0%	39.5%
	Oppose	Count	156	4	15	12	44	11	242
		% within Marital Status	34.0%	33.3%	15.6%	34.3%	28.0%	27.5%	30.3%
	Don't know	Count	146	7	27	4	50	7	241
		% within Marital Status	31.8%	58.3%	28.1%	11.4%	31.8%	17.5%	30.2%
Total		Count	459	12	96	35	157	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	165	151	316
		% within Gender	44.2%	35.4%	39.5%
	Oppose	Count	149	94	243
		% within Gender	39.9%	22.0%	30.4%
	Don't know	Count	59	182	241
		% within Gender	15.8%	42.6%	30.1%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	102	157	57	316
		% within urban/suburban/rural	47.7%	40.3%	30.2%	39.8%
	Oppose	Count	48	125	70	243
		% within urban/suburban/rural	22.4%	32.1%	37.0%	30.6%
	Don't know	Count	64	108	62	234
		% within urban/suburban/rural	29.9%	27.7%	32.8%	29.5%
Total		Count	214	390	189	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in	Yes, I live in	No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	the Austin	another part of	
<u> </u>			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	area	Texas.	Total
Redistricting	Favor	Count	63	97	24	37	91	312
		% within metro area	40.4%	40.4%	38.1%	52.9%	34.1%	39.2%
	Oppose	Count	49	70	18	15	91	243
		% within metro area	31.4%	29.2%	28.6%	21.4%	34.1%	30.5%
	Don't know	Count	44	73	21	18	85	241
		% within metro area	28.2%	30.4%	33.3%	25.7%	31.8%	30.3%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Redistricting * metro area Crosstabulation

BudgetRecoded * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	10	9	17	62	65	131	105	399
-	spending cuts	% within libcon	22.2%	18.8%	30.9%	32.5%	61.3%	82.4%	89.0%	55.3%
1	in between	Count	5	9	12	72	25	12	6	141
		% within libcon	11.1%	18.8%	21.8%	37.7%	23.6%	7.5%	5.1%	19.5%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	30	30	26	57	16	16	7	182
	revenue increases	% within libcon	66.7%	62.5%	47.3%	29.8%	15.1%	10.1%	5.9%	25.2%
Total		Count	45	48	55	191	106	159	118	722
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	28	27	6	45	102	39	145	4	396
	spending cuts	% within 7 point Party ID	20.3%	36.5%	12.0%	54.2%	84.3%	61.9%	80.1%	50.0%	55.2%
-	in between	Count	32	18	15	23	12	16	20	3	139
		% within 7 point Party ID	23.2%	24.3%	30.0%	27.7%	9.9%	25.4%	11.0%	37.5%	19.4%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	78	29	29	15	7	8	16	1	183
	revenue increases	% within 7 point Party ID	56.5%	39.2%	58.0%	18.1%	5.8%	12.7%	8.8%	12.5%	25.5%
Total		Count	138	74	50	83	121	63	181	8	718
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		aagontoooaoa ag	e el el el coltabala				
				ag	je		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	45	110	167	77	399
	spending cuts	% within age	42.1%	53.9%	54.4%	70.6%	54.9%
	in between	Count	25	46	56	16	143
		% within age	23.4%	22.5%	18.2%	14.7%	19.7%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	37	48	84	16	185
	revenue increases	% within age	34.6%	23.5%	27.4%	14.7%	25.4%
Total		Count	107	204	307	109	727
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * age Crosstabulation

BudgetRecoded * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	۱			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	14	156	115	41	50	23	399
	spending cuts	% within Education	50.0%	59.8%	52.8%	56.9%	48.1%	53.5%	55.0%
	in between	Count	7	54	45	13	19	5	143
		% within Education	25.0%	20.7%	20.6%	18.1%	18.3%	11.6%	19.7%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	7	51	58	18	35	15	184
	revenue increases	% within Education	25.0%	19.5%	26.6%	25.0%	33.7%	34.9%	25.3%
Total		Count	28	261	218	72	104	43	726
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	84	77	43	107	88	399
Dugenceoueu	spending cuts	% within Religious attendance	68.9%	66.4%	51.8%	54.3%	41.9%	54.8%
	in between	Count	17	24	15	38	50	144
		% within Religious attendance	13.9%	20.7%	18.1%	19.3%	23.8%	19.8%

	mostly or entirely through revenue increases	Count % within Religious attendance	21 17.2%	15 12.9%	25 30.1%	52 26.4%	72 34.3%	185 25.4%
Total		Count	122	116	83	197	210	728
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	272	25	71	2	5	8	16	399
Dudgenteeddeu	spending cuts	% within Race	57.7%	32.5%	54.6%	25.0%	100.0%	61.5%	66.7%	54.8%
	in between	Count	98	17	22	1	0	2	4	144
		% within Race	20.8%	22.1%	16.9%	12.5%	.0%	15.4%	16.7%	19.8%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	101	35	37	5	0	3	4	185
	revenue increases	% within Race	21.4%	45.5%	28.5%	62.5%	.0%	23.1%	16.7%	25.4%
Total		Count	471	77	130	8	5	13	24	728
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	248	4	44	22	70	11	399
	spending cuts	% within Marital Status	59.5%	33.3%	47.8%	68.8%	51.5%	28.2%	54.8%
	in between	Count	65	7	19	7	32	14	144
		% within Marital Status	15.6%	58.3%	20.7%	21.9%	23.5%	35.9%	19.8%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	104	1	29	3	34	14	185
	revenue increases	% within Marital Status	24.9%	8.3%	31.5%	9.4%	25.0%	35.9%	25.4%
Total		Count	417	12	92	32	136	39	728
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gen	der	
			Male	Female	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	227	172	399
	spending cuts	% within Gender	62.7%	47.3%	55.0%
	in between	Count	44	99	143
		% within Gender	12.2%	27.2%	19.7%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	91	93	184
	revenue increases	% within Gender	25.1%	25.5%	25.3%
Total		Count	362	364	726
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	96	189	115	400
	spending cuts	% within urban/suburban/rural	49.0%	52.9%	67.6%	55.3%
	in between	Count	42	72	29	143
		% within urban/suburban/rural	21.4%	20.2%	17.1%	19.8%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	58	96	26	180
	revenue increases	% within urban/suburban/rural	29.6%	26.9%	15.3%	24.9%
Total		Count	196	357	170	723
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

BudgetRecoded * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
BudgetRecoded	mostly or entirely through	Count	76	110	29	34	147	396
	spending cuts	% within metro area	52.1%	51.6%	50.0%	50.0%	61.5%	54.7%
	in between	Count	27	50	17	9	41	144
		% within metro area	18.5%	23.5%	29.3%	13.2%	17.2%	19.9%
	mostly or entirely through	Count	43	53	12	25	51	184
	revenue increases	% within metro area	29.5%	24.9%	20.7%	36.8%	21.3%	25.4%
Total		Count	146	213	58	68	239	724
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				libcon							
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total	
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	1	0	3	14	20	42	44	124	
primary and secondary education funding		% within libcon	2.2%	.0%	5.1%	6.1%	17.9%	25.6%	34.9%	15.6%	
	No	Count	45	57	56	217	92	122	82	671	
		% within libcon	97.8%	100.0%	94.9%	93.9%	82.1%	74.4%	65.1%	84.4%	
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	164	126	795	
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * libcon Crosstabulation

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	6	1	1	12	47	6	50	0	123
primary and secondary education funding No		% within 7 point Party ID	3.6%	1.3%	2.0%	12.9%	37.9%	9.1%	25.6%	.0%	15.6%
	No	Count	162	79	50	81	77	60	145	12	666
		% within 7 point Party ID	96.4%	98.8%	98.0%	87.1%	62.1%	90.9%	74.4%	100.0%	84.4%
Total		Count	168	80	51	93	124	66	195	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * age Crosstabulation

				age							
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total				
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	11	37	50	26	124				
primary and secondary education funding		% within age	8.4%	17.0%	15.3%	20.8%	15.5%				
	No	Count	120	181	277	99	677				
		% within age	91.6%	83.0%	84.7%	79.2%	84.5%				
Total		Count	131	218	327	125	801				
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * Education Crosstabulation

				Education								
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total			
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	6	41	41	13	15	7	123			
primary and secondary		% within Education	18.8%	13.6%	17.1%	16.9%	14.2%	16.3%	15.4%			
education funding	No	Count	26	260	199	64	91	36	676			
		% within Education	81.3%	86.4%	82.9%	83.1%	85.8%	83.7%	84.6%			
Total		Count	32	301	240	77	106	43	799			
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	23	24	11	36	31	125
primary and secondary education funding		% within Religious attendance	16.7%	18.9%	12.4%	16.6%	13.4%	15.6%
	No	Count	115	103	78	181	201	678
		% within Religious attendance	83.3%	81.1%	87.6%	83.4%	86.6%	84.4%
Total		Count	138	127	89	217	232	803
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share o	f primary	y and secondary	y education funding	* Race Crosstabulation
			_	

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	89	6	15	1	5	1	7	124
primary and secondary		% within Race	17.6%	6.3%	10.4%	10.0%	100.0%	7.1%	29.2%	15.5%
education funding	No	Count	418	90	129	9	0	13	17	676
		% within Race	82.4%	93.8%	89.6%	90.0%	.0%	92.9%	70.8%	84.5%
Total		Count	507	96	144	10	5	14	24	800

						Race				
			White / Plance	Diack	Llianania	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³	Mixed	Othor	Total
	-	_	White / Dianco	DIACK	пізрапіс	Asian	nativo	IVIIXEU	Other	TOLAI
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	89	6	15	1	5	1	7	124
primary and secondary		% within Race	17.6%	6.3%	10.4%	10.0%	100.0%	7.1%	29.2%	15.5%
education funding	No	Count	418	90	129	9	0	13	17	676
		% within Race	82.4%	93.8%	89.6%	90.0%	.0%	92.9%	70.8%	84.5%
Total		Count	507	96	144	10	5	14	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * Race Crosstabulation

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status								
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total		
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	75	4	13	8	20	4	124		
primary and secondary	·	% within Marital Status	16.3%	30.8%	13.4%	22.9%	12.7%	10.0%	15.5%		
education funding	No	Count	384	9	84	27	137	36	677		
		% within Marital Status	83.7%	69.2%	86.6%	77.1%	87.3%	90.0%	84.5%		
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	157	40	801		
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	83	41	124
primary and secondary education funding		% within Gender	22.3%	9.6%	15.5%
education funding	No	Count	290	387	677
		% within Gender	77.7%	90.4%	84.5%
Total		Count	373	428	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			urb			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	28	60	34	122
primary and secondary		% within urban/suburban/rural	13.1%	15.3%	17.9%	15.3%
education funding	No	Count	186	331	156	673
		% within urban/suburban/rural	86.9%	84.7%	82.1%	84.7%
Total		Count	214	391	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Cut the state's share of primary and secondary education funding * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	25	36	11	5	42	119
primary and secondary		% within metro area	16.1%	15.0%	17.5%	7.1%	15.7%	15.0%
education funding	No	Count	130	204	52	65	225	676
		% within metro area	83.9%	85.0%	82.5%	92.9%	84.3%	85.0%
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share	of higher edu	cation funding '	* libcon Crosstabulation
-----------------------	---------------	------------------	--------------------------

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	2	0	3	29	44	77	62	217
higher education funding		% within libcon	4.3%	.0%	5.1%	12.6%	39.3%	47.0%	49.6%	27.3%
	No	Count	44	57	56	202	68	87	63	577
		% within libcon	95.7%	100.0%	94.9%	87.4%	60.7%	53.0%	50.4%	72.7%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	164	125	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7	noint Party ID	Total
	1	point Faity ID	TULAI

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	7	10	3	19	70	14	93	1	217
higher education funding		% within 7 point Party ID	4.2%	12.5%	5.9%	20.4%	56.0%	21.2%	47.4%	8.3%	27.4%
	No	Count	161	70	48	74	55	52	103	11	574
		% within 7 point Party ID	95.8%	87.5%	94.1%	79.6%	44.0%	78.8%	52.6%	91.7%	72.6%
Total		Count	168	80	51	93	125	66	196	12	791
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Cut the state's share of higher	Yes	Count	18	56	100	44	218
education funding		% within age	13.8%	25.8%	30.5%	35.2%	27.3%
	No	Count	112	161	228	81	582
		% within age	86.2%	74.2%	69.5%	64.8%	72.8%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	11	82	71	21	24	9	218
higher education funding		% within Education	34.4%	27.2%	29.7%	26.9%	22.4%	20.5%	27.2%
	No	Count	21	219	168	57	83	35	583
		% within Education	65.6%	72.8%	70.3%	73.1%	77.6%	79.5%	72.8%
Total		Count	32	301	239	78	107	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	igious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	41	47	21	56	53	218

higher education funding		% within Religious attendance	29.7%	37.3%	23.6%	25.9%	22.8%	27.2%
	No	Count	97	79	68	160	179	583
		% within Religious attendance	70.3%	62.7%	76.4%	74.1%	77.2%	72.8%
Total		Count	138	126	89	216	232	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	169	10	25	1	2	3	8	218
higher education funding		% within Race	33.3%	10.3%	17.4%	10.0%	50.0%	21.4%	33.3%	27.3%
	No	Count	338	87	119	9	2	11	16	582
		% within Race	66.7%	89.7%	82.6%	90.0%	50.0%	78.6%	66.7%	72.8%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	4	14	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Cut the state's share of	Yes	Count	156	2	14	11	26	8	217
higher education funding		% within Marital Status	34.1%	16.7%	14.4%	31.4%	16.7%	20.0%	27.2%
	No	Count	302	10	83	24	130	32	581
		% within Marital Status	65.9%	83.3%	85.6%	68.6%	83.3%	80.0%	72.8%
Total		Count	458	12	97	35	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Cut the state's share of higher	Yes	Count	135	83	218
education funding		% within Gender	36.2%	19.4%	27.3%
	No	Count	238	344	582
		% within Gender	63.8%	80.6%	72.8%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut the state's share of higher education funding * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Cut the state's share of higher	Yes	Count	51	97	70	218
education funding		% within urban/suburban/rural	23.8%	24.9%	36.8%	27.5%
	No	Count	163	293	120	576
		% within urban/suburban/rural	76.2%	75.1%	63.2%	72.5%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			metro area							
			Yes, I live in Yes, the Houston Dall		Yes, I live in the San	Yes, I live in	No, I live in another part of			
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total		
Cut the state's share of higher education funding	Yes	Count	39	53	17	18	86	213		
		% within metro area	25.0%	22.1%	27.0%	26.1%	32.2%	26.8%		
	No	Count	117	187	46	51	181	582		
		% within metro area	75.0%	77.9%	73.0%	73.9%	67.8%	73.2%		
Total		Count	156	240	63	69	267	795		
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

ang for pro kinaorganton elacobo insoon elecclasalation	
libcon	Total

			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
End funding for pre- kindergarten classes	Yes	Count	4	3	7	56	56	101	85	312
		% within libcon	8.7%	5.4%	12.1%	24.2%	50.0%	61.2%	68.0%	39.3%
	No	Count	42	53	51	175	56	64	40	481
		% within libcon	91.3%	94.6%	87.9%	75.8%	50.0%	38.8%	32.0%	60.7%
Total		Count	46	56	58	231	112	165	125	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	24	18	3	31	90	29	119	1	315
kindergarten classes		% within 7 point Party ID	14.3%	22.5%	5.9%	33.7%	72.0%	43.9%	61.0%	8.3%	39.9%
	No	Count	144	62	48	61	35	37	76	11	474
		% within 7 point Party ID	85.7%	77.5%	94.1%	66.3%	28.0%	56.1%	39.0%	91.7%	60.1%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	195	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * age Crosstabulation

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	29	82	137	67	315
kindergarten classes		% within age	22.3%	37.8%	41.9%	53.6%	39.4%
	No	Count	101	135	190	58	484
		% within age	77.7%	62.2%	58.1%	46.4%	60.6%
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Education						
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total	
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	11	125	97	32	36	15	316	
kindergarten classes		% within Education	33.3%	41.5%	40.4%	41.6%	34.0%	34.1%	39.5%	

	No	Count	22	176	143	45	70	29	485
		% within Education	66.7%	58.5%	59.6%	58.4%	66.0%	65.9%	60.5%
Total		Count	33	301	240	77	106	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Religious attendance							
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a					
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total			
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	59	64	23	86	84	316			
kindergarten classes	_	% within Religious attendance	42.8%	50.8%	26.1%	39.8%	36.4%	39.5%			
	No	Count	79	62	65	130	147	483			
		% within Religious attendance	57.2%	49.2%	73.9%	60.2%	63.6%	60.5%			
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799			
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * Race Crosstabulation

				Race								
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			_		
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total		
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	231	19	40	2	5	5	14	316		
kindergarten classes		% within Race	45.7%	19.8%	27.8%	20.0%	100.0%	33.3%	58.3%	39.5%		
	No	Count	275	77	104	8	0	10	10	484		
		% within Race	54.3%	80.2%	72.2%	80.0%	.0%	66.7%	41.7%	60.5%		
Total		Count	506	96	144	10	5	15	24	800		
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * Marital Status Crosstabulation

 J	
Marital Status	Total
	1

			Marriad	Separated	Divoraad	Widowod	Single	Domestic	
			Marrieu	Separateu	Divorceu	widowed	Single	partnersnip	
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	207	2	33	23	38	14	317
kindergarten classes		% within Marital Status	45.1%	16.7%	34.0%	65.7%	24.2%	35.0%	39.6%
	No	Count	252	10	64	12	119	26	483
		% within Marital Status	54.9%	83.3%	66.0%	34.3%	75.8%	65.0%	60.4%
Total		Count	459	12	97	35	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	168	148	316
kindergarten classes		% within Gender	45.0%	34.7%	39.5%
	No	Count	205	279	484
		% within Gender	55.0%	65.3%	60.5%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	oan/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	67	153	96	316
kindergarten classes		% within urban/suburban/rural	31.3%	39.2%	50.5%	39.8%
	No	Count	147	237	94	478
		% within urban/suburban/rural	68.7%	60.8%	49.5%	60.2%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for pre-kindergarten classes * metro area Crosstabulation

		metro area			
Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total

End funding for pre-	Yes	Count	57	93	26	23	113	312
kindergarten classes		% within metro area	36.5%	38.8%	41.3%	32.9%	42.2%	39.1%
	No	Count	99	147	37	47	155	485
		% within metro area	63.5%	61.3%	58.7%	67.1%	57.8%	60.9%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * libcon Crosstabulation

				libcon						
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	3	2	5	30	47	74	59	220
grants to college students		% within libcon	6.5%	3.5%	8.5%	13.0%	42.0%	45.1%	46.8%	27.7%
	No	Count	43	55	54	201	65	90	67	575
		% within libcon	93.5%	96.5%	91.5%	87.0%	58.0%	54.9%	53.2%	72.3%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	164	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

				Z point Party ID								
				Not very				Not very				
			Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong			
			Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total	
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	18	11	5	21	64	14	85	3	221	
grants to college students		% within 7 point Party ID	10.7%	13.8%	9.8%	22.8%	51.2%	21.2%	43.4%	23.1%	27.9%	
	No	Count	150	69	46	71	61	52	111	10	570	
		% within 7 point Party ID	89.3%	86.3%	90.2%	77.2%	48.8%	78.8%	56.6%	76.9%	72.1%	
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	196	13	791	
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce funding of state grants	Yes	Count	19	48	101	52	220
to college students		% within age	14.6%	22.1%	30.8%	41.9%	27.5%
	No	Count	111	169	227	72	579

	% within age	85.4%	77.9%	69.2%	58.1%	72.5%
Total	Count	130	217	328	124	799
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	10	72	73	24	28	14	221
grants to college students		% within Education	31.3%	23.9%	30.4%	31.2%	26.4%	32.6%	27.7%
	No	Count	22	229	167	53	78	29	578
		% within Education	68.8%	76.1%	69.6%	68.8%	73.6%	67.4%	72.3%
Total		Count	32	301	240	77	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	42	45	18	65	52	222
grants to college students		% within Religious attendance	30.4%	35.7%	20.2%	30.0%	22.5%	27.7%
	No	Count	96	81	71	152	179	579
		% within Religious attendance	69.6%	64.3%	79.8%	70.0%	77.5%	72.3%
Total		Count	138	126	89	217	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	171	11	24	1	2	2	8	219
grants to college students		% within Race	33.8%	11.5%	16.7%	10.0%	50.0%	14.3%	33.3%	27.4%
	No	Count	335	85	120	9	2	12	16	579
		% within Race	66.2%	88.5%	83.3%	90.0%	50.0%	85.7%	66.7%	72.6%
Total		Count	506	96	144	10	4	14	24	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	150	1	25	13	27	4	220
grants to college students		% within Marital Status	32.7%	8.3%	26.0%	37.1%	17.3%	10.0%	27.6%
	No	Count	309	11	71	22	129	36	578
		% within Marital Status	67.3%	91.7%	74.0%	62.9%	82.7%	90.0%	72.4%
Total		Count	459	12	96	35	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	Ē
			Male	Female	Total
Reduce funding of state grants	Yes	Count	148	73	221
to college students		% within Gender	39.8%	17.1%	27.6%
	No	Count	224	355	579
		% within Gender	60.2%	82.9%	72.4%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

•	•	•		
			urban/suburban/rural	Total

			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Reduce funding of state grants	Yes	Count	55	99	66	220
to college students		% within urban/suburban/rural	25.6%	25.4%	34.9%	27.7%
	No	Count	160	291	123	574
		% within urban/suburban/rural	74.4%	74.6%	65.1%	72.3%
Total		Count	215	390	189	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding of state grants to college students * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Reduce funding of state	Yes	Count	36	64	17	17	84	218
grants to college students		% within metro area	23.1%	26.7%	27.0%	24.3%	31.3%	27.4%
	No	Count	120	176	46	53	184	579
		% within metro area	76.9%	73.3%	73.0%	75.7%	68.7%	72.6%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Reduce state	Yes	Count	5	2	5	44	54	94	78	282
contributions to teacher	_	% within libcon	10.6%	3.5%	8.6%	19.0%	48.6%	57.0%	61.9%	35.5%
and state employee	No	Count	42	55	53	187	57	71	48	513
retirement programs		% within libcon	89.4%	96.5%	91.4%	81.0%	51.4%	43.0%	38.1%	64.5%
Total		Count	47	57	58	231	111	165	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state em	plo	yee retirement	pro	grams * 7	point Part	y ID Crosstabulation
--	-----	----------------	-----	-----------	------------	----------------------

			7 point Pa	arty ID				
	Not very				Not very			
Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong		
Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total

Reduce state	Yes	Count	13	12	9	27	85	23	109	4	282
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.1%	15.0%	17.0%	29.3%	68.0%	34.3%	55.9%	33.3%	35.1%
and state employee	No	Count	155	68	42	65	40	44	86	8	508
retirement programs		% within 7 point Party ID	92.3%	85.0%	82.4%	70.7%	32.0%	65.7%	44.1%	66.7%	64.3%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	67	195	12	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce state contributions to	Yes	Count	25	70	131	56	282
teacher and state employee		% within age	19.1%	32.3%	40.1%	44.8%	35.3%
retirement programs	No	Count	106	147	196	69	518
		% within age	80.9%	67.7%	59.9%	55.2%	64.8%
Total		Count	131	217	327	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce state contributions	Yes	Count	12	102	96	31	30	12	283
to teacher and state employee retirement programs		% within Education	37.5%	33.9%	40.0%	40.3%	28.0%	27.3%	35.3%
	No	Count	20	199	144	46	77	32	518
		% within Education	62.5%	66.1%	60.0%	59.7%	72.0%	72.7%	64.7%
Total		Count	32	301	240	77	107	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

			Religious attendance							
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a				
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total		
Reduce state contributions	Yes	Count	54	52	31	76	70	283		
to teacher and state employee retirement		% within Religious attendance	39.1%	41.3%	34.8%	35.2%	30.3%	35.4%		

programs	No	Count % within Religious attendance	84 60.9%	74 58.7%	58 65.2%	140 64.8%	161 69.7%	517 64.6%
Total		Count % within Religious attendance	138 100.0%	126 100.0%	89 100.0%	216 100.0%	231 100.0%	800 100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Reduce state contributions	Yes	Count	210	8	43	1	1	8	12	283
to teacher and state		% within Race	41.5%	8.2%	29.9%	10.0%	20.0%	53.3%	50.0%	35.3%
employee retirement programs	No	Count	296	89	101	9	4	7	12	518
		% within Race	58.5%	91.8%	70.1%	90.0%	80.0%	46.7%	50.0%	64.7%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Reduce state contributions	Yes	Count	202	3	20	13	35	10	283
to teacher and state employee retirement programs		% within Marital Status	44.0%	25.0%	20.6%	36.1%	22.3%	25.0%	35.3%
	No	Count	257	9	77	23	122	30	518
		% within Marital Status	56.0%	75.0%	79.4%	63.9%	77.7%	75.0%	64.7%
Total		Count	459	12	97	36	157	40	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * Gender

Crosstabulation

Gender Tota

			Male	Female	
Reduce state contributions to	Yes	Count	166	117	283
teacher and state employee retirement programs		% within Gender	44.6%	27.3%	35.4%
	No	Count	206	311	517
		% within Gender	55.4%	72.7%	64.6%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce state contributions to	Yes	Count	69	136	78	283
teacher and state employee		% within urban/suburban/rural	32.2%	34.9%	41.1%	35.6%
retirement programs	No	Count	145	254	112	511
		% within urban/suburban/rural	67.8%	65.1%	58.9%	64.4%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce state contributions to teacher and state employee retirement programs * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Reduce state contributions	Yes	Count	54	81	21	25	97	278
to teacher and state employee retirement programs		% within metro area	34.8%	33.9%	33.3%	35.7%	36.3%	35.0%
	No	Count	101	158	42	45	170	516
		% within metro area	65.2%	66.1%	66.7%	64.3%	63.7%	65.0%
Total		Count	155	239	63	70	267	794
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * libcon Crosstabulation

				libcon				
ſ	Extremely						Extremely	
	liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total

End funding for the	Yes	Count	1	0	3	9	17	27	28	85
children's health		% within libcon	2.2%	.0%	5.2%	3.9%	15.2%	16.5%	22.2%	10.7%
insurance program	No	Count	45	57	55	222	95	137	98	709
		% within libcon	97.8%	100.0%	94.8%	96.1%	84.8%	83.5%	77.8%	89.3%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID										
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
End funding for the children's health insurance	Yes	Count	2	2	1	11	35	4	30	0	85
		% within 7 point Party ID	1.2%	2.5%	2.0%	11.8%	28.2%	6.1%	15.3%	.0%	10.8%
program	No	Count	165	78	50	82	89	62	166	12	704
		% within 7 point Party ID	98.8%	97.5%	98.0%	88.2%	71.8%	93.9%	84.7%	100.0%	89.2%
Total		Count	167	80	51	93	124	66	196	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * age Crosstabulation

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
End funding for the children's	Yes	Count	7	23	39	16	85
health insurance program		% within age	5.4%	10.6%	11.9%	12.8%	10.6%
	No	Count	123	195	288	109	715
		% within age	94.6%	89.4%	88.1%	87.2%	89.4%
Total		Count	130	218	327	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * Education Crosstabulation

		<u> </u>								
			Education							
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total	
End funding for the children's health insurance program	Yes	Count	2	23	29	8	14	8	84	
		% within Education	6.3%	7.7%	12.1%	10.4%	13.2%	18.2%	10.5%	
	No	Count	30	277	211	69	92	36	715	

	% within Education	93.8%	92.3%	87.9%	89.6%	86.8%	81.8%	89.5%
Total	Count	32	300	240	77	106	44	799
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
End funding for the	Yes	Count	13	15	9	26	22	85
children's health insurance program		% within Religious attendance	9.5%	11.9%	10.1%	12.0%	9.5%	10.6%
	No	Count	124	111	80	190	210	715
		% within Religious attendance	90.5%	88.1%	89.9%	88.0%	90.5%	89.4%
Total		Count	137	126	89	216	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó Asian nativo 2 2 2 2			
End funding for the	Yes	Count	61	2	9	2	2	2	8	86
children's health insurance		% within Race	12.0%	2.1%	6.2%	20.0%	50.0%	13.3%	33.3%	10.7%
program	No	Count	446	95	136	8	2	13	16	716
		% within Race	88.0%	97.9%	93.8%	80.0%	50.0%	86.7%	66.7%	89.3%
Total		Count	507	97	145	10	4	15	24	802
1		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance prog	gram * Marital Status Crosstabulation
--	---------------------------------------

Total
Marital Status

			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
End funding for the children's health insurance program	Yes	Count	60	0	7	4	10	5	86
		% within Marital Status	13.1%	.0%	7.2%	11.1%	6.4%	12.2%	10.7%
	No	Count	399	12	90	32	146	36	715
		% within Marital Status	86.9%	100.0%	92.8%	88.9%	93.6%	87.8%	89.3%
Total		Count	459	12	97	36	156	41	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
End funding for the children's	Yes	Count	59	26	85
health insurance program		% within Gender	15.9%	6.1%	10.6%
	No	Count	313	402	715
		% within Gender	84.1%	93.9%	89.4%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urban/sul			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
End funding for the children's	Yes	Count	16	37	32	85
health insurance program		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.5%	9.5%	16.8%	10.7%
	No	Count	198	353	158	709
		% within urban/suburban/rural	92.5%	90.5%	83.2%	89.3%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End funding for the children's health insurance program * metro area Crosstabulation

		metro area						
Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in				
the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of				
area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total			
End funding for the	Yes	Count	11	24	9	10	31	85
-----------------------------	-----	---------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
children's health insurance		% within metro area	7.1%	10.0%	14.3%	14.3%	11.6%	10.7%
program	No	Count	144	215	54	60	237	710
		% within metro area	92.9%	90.0%	85.7%	85.7%	88.4%	89.3%
Total		Count	155	239	63	70	268	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	15	11	24	65	41	65	36	257
regulation and leave it to		% within libcon	32.6%	19.3%	41.4%	28.1%	36.6%	39.4%	28.6%	32.3%
the federal government	No	Count	31	46	34	166	71	100	90	538
		% within libcon	67.4%	80.7%	58.6%	71.9%	63.4%	60.6%	71.4%	67.7%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	165	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	48	25	19	28	47	21	63	2	253
regulation and leave it to		% within 7 point Party ID	28.7%	31.3%	37.3%	30.4%	37.6%	31.8%	32.3%	16.7%	32.1%
the federal government	No	Count	119	55	32	64	78	45	132	10	535
		% within 7 point Party ID	71.3%	68.8%	62.7%	69.6%	62.4%	68.2%	67.7%	83.3%	67.9%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	125	66	195	12	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	36	76	108	38	258
regulation and leave it to the		% within age	27.5%	35.0%	33.0%	30.4%	32.3%
federal government	No	Count	95	141	219	87	542

	% within age	72.5%	65.0%	67.0%	69.6%	67.8%
Total	Count	131	217	327	125	800
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	19	85	82	19	37	16	258
regulation and leave it to the		% within Education	57.6%	28.3%	34.2%	24.7%	34.9%	37.2%	32.3%
federal government	No	Count	14	215	158	58	69	27	541
		% within Education	42.4%	71.7%	65.8%	75.3%	65.1%	62.8%	67.7%
Total		Count	33	300	240	77	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	47	43	28	73	67	258
regulation and leave it to the federal government		% within Religious attendance	34.1%	34.1%	31.8%	33.8%	28.9%	32.3%
	No	Count	91	83	60	143	165	542
		% within Religious attendance	65.9%	65.9%	68.2%	66.2%	71.1%	67.8%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * Race Crosstabulation

	F
Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	
End state environmental	Yes	Count	173	29	46	3	0	4	3	258
regulation and leave it to		% within Race	34.1%	29.9%	31.9%	30.0%	.0%	28.6%	13.0%	32.3%
the federal government	No	Count	334	68	98	7	5	10	20	542
		% within Race	65.9%	70.1%	68.1%	70.0%	100.0%	71.4%	87.0%	67.8%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	14	23	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	138	4	33	13	60	9	257
regulation and leave it to the federal government		% within Marital Status	30.1%	30.8%	34.4%	37.1%	38.5%	22.5%	32.2%
	No	Count	321	9	63	22	96	31	542
		% within Marital Status	69.9%	69.2%	65.6%	62.9%	61.5%	77.5%	67.8%
Total		Count	459	13	96	35	156	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	131	127	258
regulation and leave it to the		% within Gender	35.2%	29.7%	32.3%
federal government	No	Count	241	300	541
		% within Gender	64.8%	70.3%	67.7%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	77	125	57	259
regulation and leave it to the		% within urban/suburban/rural	35.8%	32.1%	30.0%	32.6%
federal government	No	Count	138	265	133	536
		% within urban/suburban/rural	64.2%	67.9%	70.0%	67.4%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

End state environmental regulation and leave it to the federal government * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
End state environmental	Yes	Count	53	74	18	19	90	254
regulation and leave it to	_	% within metro area	34.2%	31.0%	28.6%	27.1%	33.7%	32.0%
the federal government	No	Count	102	165	45	51	177	540
		% within metro area	65.8%	69.0%	71.4%	72.9%	66.3%	68.0%
Total		Count	155	239	63	70	267	794
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	4	2	2	18	30	27	26	109
providers like doctors and hospitals		% within libcon	8.5%	3.5%	3.4%	7.8%	26.8%	16.5%	20.8%	13.7%
	No	Count	43	55	57	213	82	137	99	686
		% within libcon	91.5%	96.5%	96.6%	92.2%	73.2%	83.5%	79.2%	86.3%
Total		Count	47	57	59	231	112	164	125	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation								
	7 point Party ID	Total						
		-						

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	6	9	7	9	32	10	40	1	114
providers like doctors and		% within 7 point Party ID	3.6%	11.3%	13.7%	9.7%	25.6%	15.2%	20.4%	8.3%	14.4%
hospitals	No	Count	161	71	44	84	93	56	156	11	676
		% within 7 point Party ID	96.4%	88.8%	86.3%	90.3%	74.4%	84.8%	79.6%	91.7%	85.6%
Total		Count	167	80	51	93	125	66	196	12	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	23	35	42	13	113
providers like doctors and		% within age	17.7%	16.1%	12.8%	10.4%	14.1%
hospitals	No	Count	107	182	286	112	687
		% within age	82.3%	83.9%	87.2%	89.6%	85.9%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	7	37	44	9	12	4	113
providers like doctors and hospitals		% within Education	21.2%	12.3%	18.4%	11.7%	11.3%	9.3%	14.1%
	No	Count	26	264	195	68	94	39	686
		% within Education	78.8%	87.7%	81.6%	88.3%	88.7%	90.7%	85.9%
Total		Count	33	301	239	77	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

			Reli	gious attendance			
		More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
		a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid Yes	Count	19	23	14	36	22	114

providers like doctors and hospitals	-	% within Religious attendance	13.8%	18.3%	15.7%	16.6%	9.5%	14.2%
	No	Count	119	103	75	181	209	687
		% within Religious attendance	86.2%	81.7%	84.3%	83.4%	90.5%	85.8%
Total		Count	138	126	89	217	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	75	10	22	1	0	1	3	112
providers like doctors and		% within Race	14.8%	10.4%	15.3%	10.0%	.0%	6.7%	13.0%	14.0%
hospitals	No	Count	432	86	122	9	4	14	20	687
		% within Race	85.2%	89.6%	84.7%	90.0%	100.0%	93.3%	87.0%	86.0%
Total		Count	507	96	144	10	4	15	23	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	73	1	12	3	20	4	113
providers like doctors and hospitals		% within Marital Status	15.9%	7.7%	12.4%	8.6%	12.7%	10.0%	14.1%
	No	Count	385	12	85	32	137	36	687
		% within Marital Status	84.1%	92.3%	87.6%	91.4%	87.3%	90.0%	85.9%
Total		Count	458	13	97	35	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	61	52	113
providers like doctors and		% within Gender	16.4%	12.1%	14.1%
hospitals	No	Count	311	376	687
		% within Gender	83.6%	87.9%	85.9%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	37	53	22	112
providers like doctors and		% within urban/suburban/rural	17.3%	13.6%	11.6%	14.1%
hospitals	No	Count	177	337	168	682
		% within urban/suburban/rural	82.7%	86.4%	88.4%	85.9%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut payments to Medicaid providers like doctors and hospitals * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Cut payments to Medicaid	Yes	Count	22	33	14	7	33	109
providers like doctors and		% within metro area	14.1%	13.8%	22.2%	10.0%	12.4%	13.7%
hospitals	No	Count	134	207	49	63	234	687
		% within metro area	85.9%	86.3%	77.8%	90.0%	87.6%	86.3%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * libcon Crosstabulation

libcon	Total

			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
Cut state funding for	Yes	Count	1	0	2	9	14	21	12	59
nursing home care		% within libcon	2.2%	.0%	3.4%	3.9%	12.6%	12.8%	9.5%	7.4%
	No	Count	45	57	57	222	97	143	114	735
		% within libcon	97.8%	100.0%	96.6%	96.1%	87.4%	87.2%	90.5%	92.6%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	111	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

				7 point Party ID								
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total	
Cut state funding for	Yes	Count	1	3	1	8	19	4	22	1	59	
nursing home care		% within 7 point Party ID	.6%	3.8%	2.0%	8.6%	15.3%	6.1%	11.3%	8.3%	7.5%	
	No	Count	167	77	50	85	105	62	173	11	730	
		% within 7 point Party ID	99.4%	96.3%	98.0%	91.4%	84.7%	93.9%	88.7%	91.7%	92.5%	
Total		Count	168	80	51	93	124	66	195	12	789	
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Cut state funding for nursing home care * age Crosstabulation

				а	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Cut state funding for nursing	Yes	Count	10	22	16	11	59
home care		% within age	7.7%	10.1%	4.9%	8.9%	7.4%
	No	Count	120	196	312	113	741
		% within age	92.3%	89.9%	95.1%	91.1%	92.6%
Total		Count	130	218	328	124	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			Education						
			High school						
		No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total	
Cut state funding for nursing Yes	Count	2	20	15	6	9	7	59	
home care	% within Education	6.1%	6.6%	6.3%	7.8%	8.4%	16.3%	7.4%	

Cut state funding for nursing home care * Education Crosstabulation

	No	Count	31	281	225	71	98	36	742
		% within Education	93.9%	93.4%	93.8%	92.2%	91.6%	83.7%	92.6%
Total		Count	33	301	240	77	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Religious attendance						
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a				
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total		
Cut state funding for	Yes	Count	15	6	7	15	17	60		
nursing home care		% within Religious attendance	10.9%	4.8%	8.0%	6.9%	7.3%	7.5%		
	No	Count	123	120	81	201	215	740		
		% within Religious attendance	89.1%	95.2%	92.0%	93.1%	92.7%	92.5%		
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	232	800		
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Cut state funding for nursing home care * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Cut state funding for	Yes	Count	36	1	17	1	1	0	4	60
nursing home care		% within Race	7.1%	1.0%	11.8%	10.0%	20.0%	.0%	16.7%	7.5%
	No	Count	471	96	127	9	4	15	20	742
		% within Race	92.9%	99.0%	88.2%	90.0%	80.0%	100.0%	83.3%	92.5%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	15	24	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * Marital Status Crosstabulation

								Domestic	
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	
Cut state funding for nursing	Yes	Count	34	2	4	2	17	1	60
home care		% within Marital Status	7.4%	15.4%	4.2%	5.7%	10.8%	2.5%	7.5%
	No	Count	425	11	92	33	140	39	740
		% within Marital Status	92.6%	84.6%	95.8%	94.3%	89.2%	97.5%	92.5%
Total		Count	459	13	96	35	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Cut state funding for nursing	Yes	Count	45	14	59
home care		% within Gender	12.1%	3.3%	7.4%
	No	Count	327	414	741
		% within Gender	87.9%	96.7%	92.6%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Cut state funding for nursing	Yes	Count	18	30	11	59
home care		% within urban/suburban/rural	8.4%	7.7%	5.8%	7.4%
	No	Count	197	360	179	736
		% within urban/suburban/rural	91.6%	92.3%	94.2%	92.6%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Cut state funding for nursing home care * metro area Crosstabulation

		metro area			
Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total

Cut state funding for	Yes	Count	11	16	5	3	20	55
nursing home care		% within metro area	7.1%	6.7%	7.8%	4.3%	7.5%	6.9%
	No	Count	145	224	59	67	247	742
		% within metro area	92.9%	93.3%	92.2%	95.7%	92.5%	93.1%
Total		Count	156	240	64	70	267	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
				2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Close one or more	Yes	Count	24	21	24	77	36	31	23	236
prisons for adults		% within libcon	52.2%	36.8%	41.4%	33.3%	32.1%	18.8%	18.4%	29.7%
	No	Count	22	36	34	154	76	134	102	558
		% within libcon	47.8%	63.2%	58.6%	66.7%	67.9%	81.2%	81.6%	70.3%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	165	125	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Close one or more prisons Yes for adults	Yes	Count	60	28	22	34	32	22	32	5	235
		% within 7 point Party ID	35.7%	35.0%	43.1%	37.0%	25.6%	33.3%	16.3%	41.7%	29.7%
	No	Count	108	52	29	58	93	44	164	7	555
		% within 7 point Party ID	64.3%	65.0%	56.9%	63.0%	74.4%	66.7%	83.7%	58.3%	70.3%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	196	12	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * age Crosstabulation

				age					
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total		
Close one or more prisons for	Yes	Count	37	59	103	39	238		
adults	% within age	% within age	28.5%	27.2%	31.5%	31.5%	29.8%		
	No	Count	93	158	224	85	560		

	% within age	71.5%	72.8%	68.5%	68.5%	70.2%
Total	Count	130	217	327	124	798
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	12	79	81	21	32	14	239
for adults		% within Education	36.4%	26.3%	33.8%	27.3%	30.2%	32.6%	29.9%
	No	Count	21	221	159	56	74	29	560
		% within Education	63.6%	73.7%	66.3%	72.7%	69.8%	67.4%	70.1%
Total		Count	33	300	240	77	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	igious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	38	37	25	58	80	238
for adults		% within Religious attendance	27.5%	29.4%	28.4%	26.9%	34.6%	29.8%
	No	Count	100	89	63	158	151	561
		% within Religious attendance	72.5%	70.6%	71.6%	73.1%	65.4%	70.2%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * Race Crosstabulation

Race	Total
	-

							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	147	44	37	3	1	5	3	240
for adults		% within Race	29.1%	45.4%	25.7%	30.0%	20.0%	33.3%	12.5%	30.0%
	No	Count	359	53	107	7	4	10	21	561
		% within Race	70.9%	54.6%	74.3%	70.0%	80.0%	66.7%	87.5%	70.0%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	119	5	33	15	53	14	239
for adults		% within Marital Status	25.9%	41.7%	34.0%	42.9%	34.0%	35.0%	29.9%
	No	Count	340	7	64	20	103	26	560
		% within Marital Status	74.1%	58.3%	66.0%	57.1%	66.0%	65.0%	70.1%
Total		Count	459	12	97	35	156	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Close one or more prisons for	Yes	Count	146	94	240
adults		% within Gender	39.1%	22.0%	30.0%
	No	Count	227	334	561
		% within Gender	60.9%	78.0%	70.0%
Total		Count	373	428	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

urban/suburban/rural Total

			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Close one or more prisons for	Yes	Count	75	114	45	234
adults		% within urban/suburban/rural	35.0%	29.2%	23.7%	29.5%
	No	Count	139	276	145	560
		% within urban/suburban/rural	65.0%	70.8%	76.3%	70.5%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for adults * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	56	68	14	24	77	239
for adults		% within metro area	35.9%	28.5%	21.9%	34.3%	28.8%	30.0%
	No	Count	100	171	50	46	190	557
		% within metro area	64.1%	71.5%	78.1%	65.7%	71.2%	70.0%
Total		Count	156	239	64	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Close one or more	Yes	Count	16	28	21	75	40	33	31	244
prisons for juveniles		% within libcon	34.0%	49.1%	35.6%	32.5%	36.0%	20.0%	24.6%	30.7%
	No	Count	31	29	38	156	71	132	95	552
		% within libcon	66.0%	50.9%	64.4%	67.5%	64.0%	80.0%	75.4%	69.3%
Total		Count	47	57	59	231	111	165	126	796
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Pa	arty ID				
	Not very				Not very			
Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong		
Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total

Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	47	31	30	26	36	27	38	6	241
for juveniles		% within 7 point Party ID	28.1%	38.8%	58.8%	28.3%	29.0%	40.9%	19.4%	46.2%	30.5%
	No	Count	120	49	21	66	88	39	158	7	548
		% within 7 point Party ID	71.9%	61.3%	41.2%	71.7%	71.0%	59.1%	80.6%	53.8%	69.5%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	124	66	196	13	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Close one or more prisons for	Yes	Count	40	64	103	38	245
juveniles		% within age	30.8%	29.5%	31.5%	30.4%	30.7%
	No	Count	90	153	224	87	554
		% within age	69.2%	70.5%	68.5%	69.6%	69.3%
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	7	83	89	22	29	16	246
for juveniles		% within Education	21.2%	27.6%	37.1%	28.6%	27.1%	36.4%	30.7%
	No	Count	26	218	151	55	78	28	556
		% within Education	78.8%	72.4%	62.9%	71.4%	72.9%	63.6%	69.3%
Total		Count	33	301	240	77	107	44	802
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	37	41	27	66	73	244
for juveniles		% within Religious	26.8%	32.5%	30.7%	30.6%	31.6%	30.5%
		attendance						

	No	Count	101	85	61	150	158	555
		% within Religious attendance	73.2%	67.5%	69.3%	69.4%	68.4%	69.5%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	158	40	38	3	1	4	2	246
for juveniles		% within Race	31.2%	41.2%	26.4%	30.0%	20.0%	26.7%	8.7%	30.7%
	No	Count	349	57	106	7	4	11	21	555
		% within Race	68.8%	58.8%	73.6%	70.0%	80.0%	73.3%	91.3%	69.3%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	15	23	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	al Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Close one or more prisons for juveniles	Yes	Count	128	5	37	14	42	19	245
		% within Marital Status	27.9%	41.7%	38.5%	40.0%	26.9%	47.5%	30.7%
	No	Count	331	7	59	21	114	21	553
		% within Marital Status	72.1%	58.3%	61.5%	60.0%	73.1%	52.5%	69.3%
Total		Count	459	12	96	35	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * Gender Crosstabulation

Ger	nder	
Male	Female	Total

Close one or more prisons for	Yes	Count	129	117	246
juveniles		% within Gender	34.6%	27.3%	30.7%
	No	Count	244	311	555
		% within Gender	65.4%	72.7%	69.3%
Total		Count	373	428	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Close one or more prisons for	Yes	Count	72	116	53	241
juveniles		% within urban/suburban/rural		29.7%	27.9%	30.4%
	No	Count	142	274	137	553
		% within urban/suburban/rural	66.4%	70.3%	72.1%	69.6%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Close one or more prisons for juveniles * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Close one or more prisons	Yes	Count	55	82	20	17	73	247
for juveniles		% within metro area	35.3%	34.2%	31.3%	24.3%	27.2%	31.0%
	No	Count	101	158	44	53	195	551
		% within metro area	64.7%	65.8%	68.8%	75.7%	72.8%	69.0%
Total		Count	156	240	64	70	268	798
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	19	19	16	60	23	47	38	222

highway construction		% within libcon	41.3%	33.3%	27.6%	26.0%	20.5%	28.5%	30.2%	27.9%
	No	Count	27	38	42	171	89	118	88	573
		% within libcon	58.7%	66.7%	72.4%	74.0%	79.5%	71.5%	69.8%	72.1%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	165	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce funding for new highway construction	Yes	Count	53	21	19	28	33	19	50	4	227
		% within 7 point Party ID	31.7%	26.3%	37.3%	30.1%	26.6%	28.4%	25.6%	33.3%	28.8%
	No	Count	114	59	32	65	91	48	145	8	562
		% within 7 point Party ID	68.3%	73.8%	62.7%	69.9%	73.4%	71.6%	74.4%	66.7%	71.2%
Total		Count	167	80	51	93	124	67	195	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	44	68	87	28	227
highway construction		% within age	33.6%	31.3%	26.6%	22.4%	28.4%
	No	Count	87	149	240	97	573
		% within age	66.4%	68.7%	73.4%	77.6%	71.6%
Total		Count	131	217	327	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	6	73	83	23	33	9	227
highway construction	_	% within Education	18.8%	24.3%	34.6%	29.9%	30.8%	20.5%	28.3%
	No	Count	26	228	157	54	74	35	574
		% within Education	81.3%	75.7%	65.4%	70.1%	69.2%	79.5%	71.7%

Total	Count	32	301	240	77	107	44	801
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	40	46	30	61	49	226
highway construction		% within Religious attendance	29.2%	36.5%	34.1%	28.2%	21.1%	28.3%
	No	Count	97	80	58	155	183	573
		% within Religious attendance	70.8%	63.5%	65.9%	71.8%	78.9%	71.7%
Total		Count	137	126	88	216	232	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	149	21	36	5	2	5	9	227
highway construction		% within Race	29.4%	21.9%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	35.7%	37.5%	28.4%
	No	Count	358	75	108	5	2	9	15	572
		% within Race	70.6%	78.1%	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	64.3%	62.5%	71.6%
Total		Count	507	96	144	10	4	14	24	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Marital Status						
	Domestic					
Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total

Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	130	2	28	10	39	18	227
highway construction		% within Marital Status	28.3%	16.7%	29.2%	27.8%	24.8%	45.0%	28.4%
	No	Count	329	10	68	26	118	22	573
		% within Marital Status	71.7%	83.3%	70.8%	72.2%	75.2%	55.0%	71.6%
Total		Count	459	12	96	36	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	92	135	227
highway construction		% within Gender	24.7%	31.5%	28.4%
	No	Count	280	293	573
		% within Gender	75.3%	68.5%	71.6%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	63	114	51	228
highway construction		% within urban/suburban/rural	29.3%	29.2%	26.8%	28.6%
	No	Count	152	277	139	568
		% within urban/suburban/rural	70.7%	70.8%	73.2%	71.4%
Total		Count	215	391	190	796
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for new highway construction * metro area Crosstabulation

		metro area							
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in		
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of		
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total	
Reduce funding for new	Yes	Count	55	73	18	18	64	228	
highway construction		% within metro area	35.3%	30.4%	28.6%	25.7%	23.9%	28.6%	

	No Count		101	167	45	52	204	569
		% within metro area	64.7%	69.6%	71.4%	74.3%	76.1%	71.4%
Total		Count	156	240	63	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Reduce funding for	Yes	Count	21	21	16	50	7	6	5	126
border security		% within libcon	45.7%	36.8%	27.1%	21.6%	6.3%	3.7%	4.0%	15.8%
	No	Count	25	36	43	181	105	158	121	669
		% within libcon	54.3%	63.2%	72.9%	78.4%	93.8%	96.3%	96.0%	84.2%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	164	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Reduce funding for border Y security	Yes	Count	57	12	15	20	5	6	5	2	122
		% within 7 point Party ID	34.1%	15.0%	29.4%	21.7%	4.0%	9.1%	2.6%	16.7%	15.5%
	No	Count	110	68	36	72	119	60	190	10	665
		% within 7 point Party ID	65.9%	85.0%	70.6%	78.3%	96.0%	90.9%	97.4%	83.3%	84.5%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	124	66	195	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * age Crosstabulation

				age					
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total		
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	39	50	30	8	127		
security		% within age	30.0%	22.9%	9.1%	6.4%	15.9%		
	No	Count	91	168	298	117	674		
		% within age	70.0%	77.1%	90.9%	93.6%	84.1%		
Total		Count	130	218	328	125	801		

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	39	50	30	8	127
security		% within age	30.0%	22.9%	9.1%	6.4%	15.9%
	No	Count	91	168	298	117	674
		% within age	70.0%	77.1%	90.9%	93.6%	84.1%
Total		Count	130	218	328	125	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * age Crosstabulation

Reduce funding for border security * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	5	42	35	11	23	9	125
security		% within Education	15.6%	14.0%	14.6%	14.3%	21.7%	20.9%	15.7%
	No	Count	27	258	205	66	83	34	673
		% within Education	84.4%	86.0%	85.4%	85.7%	78.3%	79.1%	84.3%
Total		Count	32	300	240	77	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security	* Religious attendance C	Crosstabulation
------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Reduce funding for border security	Yes	Count	13	12	11	41	49	126
		% within Religious attendance	9.4%	9.5%	12.5%	19.0%	21.2%	15.8%
	No	Count	125	114	77	175	182	673
		% within Religious attendance	90.6%	90.5%	87.5%	81.0%	78.8%	84.2%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						Race				
			White / Plance	Black	Llianania	Acion	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³	Mixed	Othor	Total
	-		White / Biarico	DIACK	пізрапіс	Asidii	Tialivo	wixeu	Other	TOLAI
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	68	10	37	4	0	6	0	125
security		% within Race	13.4%	10.4%	25.7%	40.0%	.0%	40.0%	.0%	15.6%
	No	Count	438	86	107	6	5	9	24	675
		% within Race	86.6%	89.6%	74.3%	60.0%	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	84.4%
Total		Count	506	96	144	10	5	15	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * Race Crosstabulation

Reduce funding for border security * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	54	1	14	5	42	9	125
security		% within Marital Status	11.8%	8.3%	14.6%	13.9%	26.9%	22.5%	15.7%
	No	Count	404	11	82	31	114	31	673
		% within Marital Status	88.2%	91.7%	85.4%	86.1%	73.1%	77.5%	84.3%
Total		Count	458	12	96	36	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	Gender				
			Male	Female	Total			
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	57	69	126			
security		% within Gender	15.3%	16.2%	15.8%			
	No Count		316	358	674			
		% within Gender	84.7%	83.8%	84.3%			
Total		Count	373	427	800			
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	46	63	18	127
security		% within urban/suburban/rural	21.4%	16.2%	9.5%	16.0%
	No	Count	169	327	172	668
		% within urban/suburban/rural	78.6%	83.8%	90.5%	84.0%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Reduce funding for border security * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Reduce funding for border security * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Reduce funding for border	Yes	Count	19	57	8	19	25	128
security		% within metro area	12.2%	23.8%	12.5%	27.1%	9.3%	16.0%
	No	Count	137	183	56	51	243	670
		% within metro area	87.8%	76.3%	87.5%	72.9%	90.7%	84.0%
Total		Count	156	240	64	70	268	798
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	32	42	46	152	67	90	65	494
impose taxes and fees on	on	% within libcon	69.6%	73.7%	79.3%	65.8%	59.8%	54.9%	52.0%	62.3%
gambling establishments	No	Count	14	15	12	79	45	74	60	299
		% within libcon	30.4%	26.3%	20.7%	34.2%	40.2%	45.1%	48.0%	37.7%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	125	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

7 point Party ID	Total

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	116	53	38	55	76	36	109	5	488
impose taxes and fees on		% within 7 point Party ID	69.0%	66.3%	74.5%	59.8%	61.3%	53.7%	55.6%	41.7%	61.8%
gambling establishments	No	Count	52	27	13	37	48	31	87	7	302
		% within 7 point Party ID	31.0%	33.8%	25.5%	40.2%	38.7%	46.3%	44.4%	58.3%	38.2%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	124	67	196	12	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Legalize gambling and impose	Yes	Count	79	140	209	70	498
taxes and fees on gambling establishments		% within age	60.8%	64.2%	63.9%	56.5%	62.3%
	No	Count	51	78	118	54	301
		% within age	39.2%	35.8%	36.1%	43.5%	37.7%
Total		Count	130	218	327	124	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	18	179	161	44	70	27	499
impose taxes and fees on	on	% within Education	54.5%	59.5%	67.1%	57.1%	66.0%	61.4%	62.3%
gambling establishments	No	Count	15	122	79	33	36	17	302
		% within Education	45.5%	40.5%	32.9%	42.9%	34.0%	38.6%	37.7%
Total		Count	33	301	240	77	106	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Religious attendance						
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a				
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total		
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	58	61	51	152	176	498		

impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments	-	% within Religious attendance	42.0%	48.4%	58.0%	70.0%	76.2%	62.3%
	No	Count	80	65	37	65	55	302
		% within Religious attendance	58.0%	51.6%	42.0%	30.0%	23.8%	37.8%
Total		Count	138	126	88	217	231	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	331	56	82	3	4	13	10	499
impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments		% within Race	65.3%	57.7%	56.6%	30.0%	80.0%	92.9%	41.7%	62.2%
	No	Count	176	41	63	7	1	1	14	303
		% within Race	34.7%	42.3%	43.4%	70.0%	20.0%	7.1%	58.3%	37.8%
Total		Count	507	97	145	10	5	14	24	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Legalize gambling	and impose taxes	s and fees on g	gambling establishments	* Marital Status	Crosstabulation
--	-------------------	------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------------

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	290	5	57	24	94	28	498
impose taxes and fees on	on	% within Marital Status	63.3%	38.5%	59.4%	66.7%	59.9%	70.0%	62.3%
gambling establishments	No	Count	168	8	39	12	63	12	302
		% within Marital Status	36.7%	61.5%	40.6%	33.3%	40.1%	30.0%	37.8%
Total		Count	458	13	96	36	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

		CIOSSIADUIALIOII			
			Ger	nder	-
			Male	Female	Total
Legalize gambling and impose	Yes	Count	251	247	498
taxes and fees on gambling		% within Gender	67.5%	57.7%	62.3%
establishments	No	Count	121	181	302
		% within Gender	32.5%	42.3%	37.8%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * Gender Crosstabulation

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling	Yes	Count	130	245	123	498
		% within urban/suburban/rural	60.7%	62.8%	64.7%	62.7%
establishments	No	Count	84	145	67	296
		% within urban/suburban/rural	39.3%	37.2%	35.3%	37.3%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize gambling and impose taxes and fees on gambling establishments * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Legalize gambling and	Yes	Count	94	166	37	42	159	498
impose taxes and fees on		% within metro area	60.6%	69.2%	58.7%	60.0%	59.6%	62.6%
gambling establishments	No	Count	61	74	26	28	108	297
		% within metro area	39.4%	30.8%	41.3%	40.0%	40.4%	37.4%
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Increase taxes on	Yes	Count	27	35	30	112	57	67	60	388
alcoholic beverages		% within libcon	58.7%	61.4%	51.7%	48.5%	50.9%	40.6%	48.0%	48.9%
	No	Count	19	22	28	119	55	98	65	406
		% within libcon	41.3%	38.6%	48.3%	51.5%	49.1%	59.4%	52.0%	51.1%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	165	125	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

-						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Increase taxes on	Yes	Count	94	35	31	45	52	33	94	6	390
Increase taxes on Yes alcoholic beverages	% within 7 point Party ID	56.0%	43.8%	60.8%	48.9%	41.6%	50.0%	48.2%	50.0%	49.4%	
	No	Count	74	45	20	47	73	33	101	6	399
		% within 7 point Party ID	44.0%	56.3%	39.2%	51.1%	58.4%	50.0%	51.8%	50.0%	50.6%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	195	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Increase taxes on alcoholic	Yes	Count	61	106	163	65	395
beverages		% within age	46.9%	48.6%	49.7%	52.0%	49.3%
	No	Count	69	112	165	60	406
		% within age	53.1%	51.4%	50.3%	48.0%	50.7%
Total		Count	130	218	328	125	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Education Crosstabulation

		Education							
	No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total		
Increase taxes on alcoholic Yes Count	16	149	121	36	46	27	395		

beverages	-	% within Education	48.5%	49.5%	50.4%	46.2%	43.4%	61.4%	49.3%
	No	Count	17	152	119	42	60	17	407
		% within Education	51.5%	50.5%	49.6%	53.8%	56.6%	38.6%	50.7%
Total		Count	33	301	240	78	106	44	802
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Increase taxes on alcoholic	Yes	Count	82	73	42	93	104	394
beverages		% within Religious attendance	59.4%	57.5%	47.2%	43.1%	45.0%	49.2%
	No	Count	56	54	47	123	127	407
		% within Religious attendance	40.6%	42.5%	52.8%	56.9%	55.0%	50.8%
Total		Count	138	127	89	216	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Increase taxes on	Yes	Count	255	43	74	8	0	8	7	395
alcoholic beverages		% within Race	50.3%	44.3%	51.4%	80.0%	.0%	57.1%	30.4%	49.4%
	No	Count	252	54	70	2	5	6	16	405
		% within Race	49.7%	55.7%	48.6%	20.0%	100.0%	42.9%	69.6%	50.6%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	14	23	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status								
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total		
Increase taxes on alcoholic	Yes	Count	239	6	48	22	63	17	395		
beverages		% within Marital Status	52.1%	46.2%	49.5%	62.9%	40.1%	42.5%	49.3%		
	No	Count	220	7	49	13	94	23	406		
		% within Marital Status	47.9%	53.8%	50.5%	37.1%	59.9%	57.5%	50.7%		
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	157	40	801		
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Increase taxes on alcoholic	Yes	Count	161	233	394
beverages		% within Gender	43.3%	54.6%	49.3%
	No	Count	211	194	405
		% within Gender	56.7%	45.4%	50.7%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Increase taxes on alcoholic	Yes	Count	106	184	103	393
beverages		% within urban/suburban/rural	49.3%	47.2%	54.2%	49.4%
	No	Count	109	206	87	402
		% within urban/suburban/rural	50.7%	52.8%	45.8%	50.6%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase taxes on alcoholic beverages * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Increase taxes on alcoholic	Yes	Count	67	119	26	37	146	395
beverages		% within metro area	42.9%	49.6%	40.6%	52.9%	54.5%	49.5%
	No	Count	89	121	38	33	122	403
		% within metro area	57.1%	50.4%	59.4%	47.1%	45.5%	50.5%
Total		Count	156	240	64	70	268	798
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Legalize the use of	Yes	Count	32	41	37	101	47	40	24	322
marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase		% within libcon	69.6%	71.9%	63.8%	43.7%	42.3%	24.4%	19.2%	40.7%
	No	Count	14	16	21	130	64	124	101	470
		% within libcon	30.4%	28.1%	36.2%	56.3%	57.7%	75.6%	80.8%	59.3%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	111	164	125	792
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Legalize the use of	Yes	Count	95	31	38	48	50	22	30	3	317
marijuana and imposes	S	% within 7 point Party ID	56.9%	38.8%	74.5%	52.2%	40.3%	33.3%	15.3%	25.0%	40.2%
taxes on its purchase	No	Count	72	49	13	44	74	44	166	9	471
		% within 7 point Party ID	43.1%	61.3%	25.5%	47.8%	59.7%	66.7%	84.7%	75.0%	59.8%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	124	66	196	12	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Legalize the use of marijuana	Yes	Count	76	101	122	28	327

and imposes taxes on its		% within age	58.0%	46.5%	37.2%	22.4%	40.8%
purchase	No	Count	55	116	206	97	474
		% within age	42.0%	53.5%	62.8%	77.6%	59.2%
Total		Count	131	217	328	125	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * Education Crosstabulation

				Education								
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total			
Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase	Yes	Count	14	102	109	33	52	17	327			
		% within Education	42.4%	33.9%	45.4%	42.3%	48.6%	39.5%	40.8%			
	No	Count	19	199	131	45	55	26	475			
		% within Education	57.6%	66.1%	54.6%	57.7%	51.4%	60.5%	59.2%			
Total		Count	33	301	240	78	107	43	802			
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase	Yes	Count	30	32	28	100	137	327
		% within Religious attendance	21.7%	25.2%	31.8%	46.1%	59.3%	40.8%
	No	Count	108	95	60	117	94	474
		% within Religious attendance	78.3%	74.8%	68.2%	53.9%	40.7%	59.2%
Total		Count	138	127	88	217	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race	Total
	1

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	
Legalize the use of	Yes	Count	211	44	43	4	3	11	11	327
marijuana and imposes		% within Race	41.7%	45.4%	29.9%	40.0%	60.0%	73.3%	47.8%	40.9%
taxes on its purchase	No	Count	295	53	101	6	2	4	12	473
		% within Race	58.3%	54.6%	70.1%	60.0%	40.0%	26.7%	52.2%	59.1%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	23	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status							
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total	
Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase	Yes	Count	156	4	44	15	81	26	326	
		% within Marital Status	34.0%	30.8%	45.8%	42.9%	51.6%	65.0%	40.8%	
	No	Count	303	9	52	20	76	14	474	
		% within Marital Status	66.0%	69.2%	54.2%	57.1%	48.4%	35.0%	59.3%	
Total		Count	459	13	96	35	157	40	800	
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Legalize the use of marijuana	Yes	Count	175	151	326
and imposes taxes on its		% within Gender	47.0%	35.4%	40.8%
purchase	No	Count	197	276	473
		% within Gender	53.0%	64.6%	59.2%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

urban/suburban/rural Total

			Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase	Yes	Count	90	178	58	326
		% within urban/suburban/rural	42.1%	45.6%	30.5%	41.1%
	No	Count	124	212	132	468
		% within urban/suburban/rural	57.9%	54.4%	69.5%	58.9%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes taxes on its purchase * metro area Crosstabulation

			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Legalize the use of marijuana and imposes	Yes	Count	66	116	20	38	82	322
		% within metro area	42.3%	48.5%	31.3%	54.3%	30.7%	40.5%
taxes on its purchase	No	Count	90	123	44	32	185	474
		% within metro area	57.7%	51.5%	68.8%	45.7%	69.3%	59.5%
Total		Count	156	239	64	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * libcon Crosstabulation

				libcon							
			Extremely						Extremely		
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total	
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	24	28	24	44	10	12	5	147	
surcharge on certain new		% within libcon	52.2%	49.1%	41.4%	19.0%	8.9%	7.3%	4.0%	18.5%	
vehicles	No	Count	22	29	34	187	102	152	121	647	
		% within libcon	47.8%	50.9%	58.6%	81.0%	91.1%	92.7%	96.0%	81.5%	
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	126	794	
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Adopt a ruel memclency surcharge on certain new venicles "7 point Party iD crosstabulation											
	7 point Party ID										
		Not very				Not very					
	Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong	1			
	Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total		

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	50	18	28	20	6	11	11	2	146
surcharge on certain new		% within 7 point Party ID	29.8%	22.5%	54.9%	21.7%	4.8%	16.7%	5.6%	15.4%	18.5%
vehicles	No	Count	118	62	23	72	119	55	185	11	645
		% within 7 point Party ID	70.2%	77.5%	45.1%	78.3%	95.2%	83.3%	94.4%	84.6%	81.5%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	196	13	791
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * age Crosstabulation

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	32	42	59	13	146
surcharge on certain new		% within age	24.6%	19.4%	18.0%	10.4%	18.3%
vehicles	No	Count	98	175	268	112	653
		% within age	75.4%	80.6%	82.0%	89.6%	81.7%
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * Education Crosstabulation

				Education								
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total			
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	4	27	54	17	32	12	146			
surcharge on certain new	_	% within Education	12.5%	9.0%	22.5%	22.1%	29.9%	27.9%	18.3%			
vehicles	No	Count	28	273	186	60	75	31	653			
		% within Education	87.5%	91.0%	77.5%	77.9%	70.1%	72.1%	81.7%			
Total		Count	32	300	240	77	107	43	799			
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

			Religious attendance							
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a				
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total		
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	17	13	10	43	64	147		
surcharge on certain new		% within Religious	12.3%	10.3%	11.4%	19.9%	27.6%	18.4%		
vehicles		attendance								

	No	Count	121	113	78	173	168	653
		% within Religious attendance	87.7%	89.7%	88.6%	80.1%	72.4%	81.6%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	100	14	19	3	0	7	5	148
surcharge on certain new		% within Race	19.7%	14.4%	13.2%	33.3%	.0%	46.7%	20.8%	18.5%
vehicles	No	Count	407	83	125	6	5	8	19	653
		% within Race	80.3%	85.6%	86.8%	66.7%	100.0%	53.3%	79.2%	81.5%
Total		Count	507	97	144	9	5	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status								
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total		
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	77	4	18	8	31	10	148		
surcharge on certain new		% within Marital Status	16.8%	30.8%	18.8%	22.2%	19.9%	25.0%	18.5%		
vehicles	No	Count	382	9	78	28	125	30	652		
		% within Marital Status	83.2%	69.2%	81.3%	77.8%	80.1%	75.0%	81.5%		
Total		Count	459	13	96	36	156	40	800		
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * Gender Crosstabulation

Ger	nder				
Male	Total				
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes Count		73	74	147
---------------------------	-----------	-----------------	--------	--------	--------
surcharge on certain new		% within Gender	19.6%	17.3%	18.4%
vehicles	No	Count	300	353	653
		% within Gender	80.4%	82.7%	81.6%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	46	81	20	147
surcharge on certain new		% within urban/suburban/rural	21.4%	20.8%	10.5%	18.5%
vehicles	No	Count	169	309	170	648
		% within urban/suburban/rural	78.6%	79.2%	89.5%	81.5%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Adopt a fuel inefficiency surcharge on certain new vehicles * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Adopt a fuel inefficiency	Yes	Count	33	49	7	21	36	146
surcharge on certain new		% within metro area	21.3%	20.4%	10.9%	30.4%	13.5%	18.4%
vehicles	No	Count	122	191	57	48	231	649
		% within metro area	78.7%	79.6%	89.1%	69.6%	86.5%	81.6%
Total		Count	155	240	64	69	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Ban the use of cell	Yes	Count	27	33	26	117	61	65	52	381

phones while driving and		% within libcon	58.7%	57.9%	44.1%	50.6%	54.5%	39.4%	41.6%	47.9%
charge fines for	No	Count	19	24	33	114	51	100	73	414
individuals who break this law.		% within libcon	41.3%	42.1%	55.9%	49.4%	45.5%	60.6%	58.4%	52.1%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	165	125	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

-				7 point Party ID Not very Not very g strong Lean strong Strong Lean at Democrat Independent Republican Republican Republican									
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total		
Ban the use of cell phones Yes while driving and charge fines for individuals who here it this low. No	Yes	Count	88	36	34	41	56	27	89	5	376		
	% within 7 point Party ID	52.4%	45.0%	66.7%	44.6%	44.8%	40.9%	45.4%	41.7%	47.6%			
	Count	80	44	17	51	69	39	107	7	414			
break this law.		% within 7 point Party ID	47.6%	55.0%	33.3%	55.4%	55.2%	59.1%	54.6%	58.3%	52.4%		
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	196	12	790		
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law.	Yes	Count	42	110	153	77	382
		% within age	32.3%	50.7%	46.6%	61.6%	47.8%
	No	Count	88	107	175	48	418
		% within age	67.7%	49.3%	53.4%	38.4%	52.3%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * Education Crosstabulation

					Education			ſ	
I				High school			(1	
1			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law.	Yes	Count	19	145	117	32	51	17	381
		% within Education	57.6%	48.3%	48.8%	41.6%	47.7%	39.5%	47.6%
	No	Count	14	155	123	45	56	26	419
		% within Education	42.4%	51.7%	51.2%	58.4%	52.3%	60.5%	52.4%

Total	Count	33	300	240	77	107	43	800
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a	Novor	Total
	-		a week	Once a week	попш	year	INEVEI	TOLAI
Ban the use of cell phones	Yes	Count	68	67	32	88	126	381
while driving and charge fines for individuals who		% within Religious attendance	49.6%	53.2%	36.4%	40.6%	54.5%	47.7%
preak this law. No	No	Count	69	59	56	129	105	418
		% within Religious attendance	50.4%	46.8%	63.6%	59.4%	45.5%	52.3%
Total		Count	137	126	88	217	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Ban the use of cell phones Y while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law.	Yes	Count	238	44	81	4	0	4	11	382
		% within Race	47.0%	45.4%	56.3%	40.0%	.0%	26.7%	45.8%	47.7%
	No	Count	268	53	63	6	5	11	13	419
		% within Race	53.0%	54.6%	43.8%	60.0%	100.0%	73.3%	54.2%	52.3%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * Marital Status Crosstabulation

Marital Status						
					Domestic	
Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total

Ban the use of cell phones	Yes	Count	208	5	49	21	77	20	380
while driving and charge		% within Marital Status	45.3%	41.7%	51.0%	60.0%	49.4%	50.0%	47.6%
fines for individuals who	No	Count	251	7	47	14	79	20	418
break this law.		% within Marital Status	54.7%	58.3%	49.0%	40.0%	50.6%	50.0%	52.4%
Total		Count	459	12	96	35	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Ban the use of cell phones	Yes	Count	158	223	381
while driving and charge fines	163	% within Gender	42.5%	52.2%	47.7%
for individuals who break this	No	Count	214	204	418
law.		% within Gender	57.5%	47.8%	52.3%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Ban the use of cell phones	Yes	Count	117	170	94	381
while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this		% within urban/suburban/rural	54.4%	43.6%	49.5%	47.9%
	No	Count	98	220	96	414
law.		% within urban/suburban/rural	45.6%	56.4%	50.5%	52.1%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Ban the use of cell phones while driving and charge fines for individuals who break this law. * metro area Crosstabulation

			metro area			
	Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
	the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
	area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Ban the use of cell phones Yes Count	59	107	31	31	149	377

while driving and charge	-	% within metro area	37.8%	44.8%	49.2%	44.3%	55.8%	47.4%
fines for individuals who	No	Count	97	132	32	39	118	418
break this law.		% within metro area	62.2%	55.2%	50.8%	55.7%	44.2%	52.6%
Total		Count	156	239	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Eliminate the August	Yes	Count	17	24	28	69	53	90	46	327
state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does		% within libcon	37.0%	42.1%	48.3%	29.9%	47.3%	54.9%	36.8%	41.2%
	No	Count	29	33	30	162	59	74	79	466
not improve.		% within libcon	63.0%	57.9%	51.7%	70.1%	52.7%	45.1%	63.2%	58.8%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	125	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holidar	v if the hudget situation does not in	norovo * 7 point Party	ID Crosstabulation
Eliminate the August state sales tax holida	y ii the budget situation does not in	πριονε. Γροπιταιιγ	ID GIOSSIADUIALIOII

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	58	30	26	33	53	28	95	4	327
sales tax holiday if the		% within 7 point Party ID	34.5%	37.5%	51.0%	35.5%	42.4%	42.4%	48.5%	33.3%	41.3%
budget situation does not	No	Count	110	50	25	60	72	38	101	8	464
improve.		% within 7 point Party ID	65.5%	62.5%	49.0%	64.5%	57.6%	57.6%	51.5%	66.7%	58.7%
Total		Count	168	80	51	93	125	66	196	12	791
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	46	92	141	52	331
sales tax holiday if the budget		% within age	35.1%	42.2%	43.1%	41.6%	41.3%
situation does not improve.	No	Count	85	126	186	73	470
		% within age	64.9%	57.8%	56.9%	58.4%	58.7%

Total	Count	131	218	327	125	801
	% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	5	117	97	35	56	20	330
sales tax holiday if the	e	% within Education	15.6%	38.9%	40.4%	45.5%	52.8%	45.5%	41.3%
budget situation does not	No	Count	27	184	143	42	50	24	470
improve.		% within Education	84.4%	61.1%	59.6%	54.5%	47.2%	54.5%	58.8%
Total		Count	32	301	240	77	106	44	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	igious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	51	69	23	90	97	330
sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not		% within Religious attendance	37.2%	54.8%	25.8%	41.7%	42.0%	41.3%
improve.	No	Count	86	57	66	126	134	469
		% within Religious attendance	62.8%	45.2%	74.2%	58.3%	58.0%	58.7%
Total		Count	137	126	89	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * Race Crosstabulation

			Race				
				Native			
				American /			
				Americano			
				indÃ-gena Ã ³			
White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the	Yes	Count	235	31	51	4	0	1	7	329
		% within Race	46.4%	32.3%	35.4%	44.4%	.0%	6.7%	30.4%	41.2%
budget situation does not	No	Count	272	65	93	5	5	14	16	470
improve.		% within Race	53.6%	67.7%	64.6%	55.6%	100.0%	93.3%	69.6%	58.8%
Total		Count	507	96	144	9	5	15	23	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the	Yes	Count	209	4	42	15	46	15	331
		% within Marital Status	45.5%	30.8%	43.3%	42.9%	29.3%	37.5%	41.3%
budget situation does not	No	Count	250	9	55	20	111	25	470
improve.		% within Marital Status	54.5%	69.2%	56.7%	57.1%	70.7%	62.5%	58.7%
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	157	40	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	142	188	330
sales tax holiday if the budget		% within Gender	38.2%	43.9%	41.3%
situation does not improve.	No	Count	230	240	470
		% within Gender	61.8%	56.1%	58.8%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

				urban/suburban/rural				
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total		
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	80	172	79	331		

sales tax holiday if the budget		% within urban/suburban/rural	37.2%	44.0%	41.6%	41.6%
situation does not improve.	No	Count	135	219	111	465
		% within urban/suburban/rural	62.8%	56.0%	58.4%	58.4%
Total		Count	215	391	190	796
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Eliminate the August state sales tax holiday if the budget situation does not improve. * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort	Yes, I live in the San	Yes. I live in	No, I live in another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Eliminate the August state	Yes	Count	64	110	22	31	103	330
sales tax holiday if the		% within metro area	41.3%	45.8%	34.4%	44.3%	38.6%	41.5%
budget situation does not	No	Count	91	130	42	39	164	466
improve.		% within metro area	58.7%	54.2%	65.6%	55.7%	61.4%	58.5%
Total		Count	155	240	64	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	28	24	18	54	7	10	2	143
businesses		% within libcon	60.9%	42.1%	31.0%	23.4%	6.3%	6.1%	1.6%	18.1%
	No	Count	18	33	40	177	104	154	123	649
		% within libcon	39.1%	57.9%	69.0%	76.6%	93.7%	93.9%	98.4%	81.9%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	111	164	125	792
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Increase the state tax on businesses	Yes	Count % within 7 point Party ID	62 36.9%	21 26.3%	23 45.1%	14 15.2%	4 3.2%	7 10.6%	12 6.2%	2 15.4%	145 18.4%

	No	Count	106	59	28	78	121	59	183	11	645
		% within 7 point Party ID	63.1%	73.8%	54.9%	84.8%	96.8%	89.4%	93.8%	84.6%	81.6%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	195	13	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * age Crosstabulation

				age						
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total			
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	30	41	65	8	144			
businesses		% within age	23.1%	18.9%	19.9%	6.4%	18.0%			
	No	Count	100	176	262	117	655			
		% within age	76.9%	81.1%	80.1%	93.6%	82.0%			
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799			
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Increase the state tax on businesses * Education Crosstabulation

				Education							
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total		
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	2	39	46	20	25	13	145		
businesses		% within Education	6.1%	13.0%	19.2%	26.0%	23.4%	30.2%	18.1%		
	No	Count	31	262	194	57	82	30	656		
		% within Education	93.9%	87.0%	80.8%	74.0%	76.6%	69.8%	81.9%		
Total		Count	33	301	240	77	107	43	801		
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Increase the state tax on businesses * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Religious attendance							
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a					
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total			
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	17	17	13	48	49	144			
businesses		% within Religious attendance	12.3%	13.5%	14.6%	22.2%	21.2%	18.0%			
	No	Count	121	109	76	168	182	656			

	% within Religious attendance	87.7%	86.5%	85.4%	77.8%	78.8%	82.0%
Total	Count	138	126	89	216	231	800
	% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	89	18	29	4	0	3	2	145
businesses		% within Race	17.6%	18.6%	20.1%	40.0%	.0%	21.4%	8.3%	18.1%
	No	Count	417	79	115	6	5	11	22	655
		% within Race	82.4%	81.4%	79.9%	60.0%	100.0%	78.6%	91.7%	81.9%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	14	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * Marital Status Crosstabulation

				Marital Status								
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total			
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	73	2	14	1	39	14	143			
businesses		% within Marital Status	15.9%	16.7%	14.6%	2.9%	25.0%	35.0%	17.9%			
	No	Count	385	10	82	34	117	26	654			
		% within Marital Status	84.1%	83.3%	85.4%	97.1%	75.0%	65.0%	82.1%			
Total		Count	458	12	96	35	156	40	797			
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Increase the state tax on businesses * Gender Crosstabulation

				Male	Female	Total
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count		62	82	144

businesses	_	% within Gender	16.7%	19.2%	18.0%
	No	Count	310	345	655
		% within Gender	83.3%	80.8%	82.0%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	44	74	27	145
businesses		% within urban/suburban/rural	20.6%	19.0%	14.2%	18.3%
	No	Count	170	316	163	649
		% within urban/suburban/rural	79.4%	81.0%	85.8%	81.7%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state tax on businesses * metro area Crosstabulation

				metro area								
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in					
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of					
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total				
Increase the state tax on	Yes	Count	27	48	8	18	43	144				
businesses		% within metro area	17.4%	20.0%	12.7%	25.7%	16.1%	18.1%				
	No	Count	128	192	55	52	224	651				
		% within metro area	82.6%	80.0%	87.3%	74.3%	83.9%	81.9%				
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795				
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * libcon Crosstabulation

				libcon								
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total		
Increase the state sales	Yes	Count	8	10	11	30	10	16	6	91		
tax rate (currently 6.25%)		% within libcon	17.4%	17.5%	18.6%	13.0%	9.0%	9.8%	4.8%	11.5%		

	No	Count	38	47	48	201	101	148	120	703
		% within libcon	82.6%	82.5%	81.4%	87.0%	91.0%	90.2%	95.2%	88.5%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	111	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Increase the state sales	Yes	Count	29	10	12	6	12	6	16	3	94
tax rate (currently 6.25%)		% within 7 point Party ID	17.4%	12.5%	23.5%	6.5%	9.6%	9.1%	8.2%	25.0%	11.9%
· · · · · -	No	Count	138	70	39	86	113	60	179	9	694
		% within 7 point Party ID	82.6%	87.5%	76.5%	93.5%	90.4%	90.9%	91.8%	75.0%	88.1%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	125	66	195	12	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * age Crosstabulation

				age						
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total			
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	11	24	48	13	96			
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within age	8.5%	11.1%	14.7%	10.4%	12.0%			
	No	Count	119	193	279	112	703			
		% within age	91.5%	88.9%	85.3%	89.6%	88.0%			
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799			
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	1	20	38	16	9	11	95
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within Education	3.1%	6.7%	15.9%	20.8%	8.4%	25.0%	11.9%
	No	Count	31	280	201	61	98	33	704
		% within Education	96.9%	93.3%	84.1%	79.2%	91.6%	75.0%	88.1%
Total		Count	32	300	239	77	107	44	799

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	1	20	38	16	9	11	95
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within Education	3.1%	6.7%	15.9%	20.8%	8.4%	25.0%	11.9%
	No	Count	31	280	201	61	98	33	704
		% within Education	96.9%	93.3%	84.1%	79.2%	91.6%	75.0%	88.1%
Total		Count	32	300	239	77	107	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Education Crosstabulation

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	15	13	6	24	38	96
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within Religious attendance	10.9%	10.2%	6.8%	11.1%	16.5%	12.0%
-	No	Count	123	114	82	193	193	705
Tatal		% within Religious attendance	89.1%	89.8%	93.2%	88.9%	83.5%	88.0%
Total		Count	138	127	88	217	231	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Plance	Black	Hispopia	Acion	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³	Mixed	Othor	Total
	-		White / Dianco	DIACK	пізрапіс	Asian	Tialivu	IVIIXEU	Other	TULAI
Increase the state sales	Yes	Count	64	12	17	1	0	0	2	96
tax rate (currently 6.25%)		% within Race	12.6%	12.4%	11.8%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	12.0%
	No	Count	442	85	127	9	5	15	22	705
		% within Race	87.4%	87.6%	88.2%	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%	88.0%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	24	801

-						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Increase the state sales	Yes	Count	64	12	17	1	0	0	2	96
tax rate (currently 6.25%)	100	% within Race	12.6%	12.4%	11.8%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	- 8.3%	12.0%
	No	Count	442	85	127	9	5	15	22	705
		% within Race	87.4%	87.6%	88.2%	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%	88.0%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	5	15	24	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Race Crosstabulation

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	61	1	9	4	14	6	95
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within Marital Status	13.3%	8.3%	9.3%	11.4%	9.0%	15.0%	11.9%
	No	Count	397	11	88	31	142	34	703
		% within Marital Status	86.7%	91.7%	90.7%	88.6%	91.0%	85.0%	88.1%
Total		Count	458	12	97	35	156	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	57	39	96
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within Gender	15.3%	9.1%	12.0%
	No	Count	316	388	704
		% within Gender	84.7%	90.9%	88.0%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	27	42	26	95
rate (currently 6.25%)	_	% within urban/suburban/rural	12.6%	10.8%	13.8%	12.0%
	No	Count	187	348	163	698
		% within urban/suburban/rural	87.4%	89.2%	86.2%	88.0%
Total		Count	214	390	189	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

Increase the state sales tax rate (currently 6.25%) * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Increase the state sales tax	Yes	Count	14	26	8	13	34	95
rate (currently 6.25%)		% within metro area	9.0%	10.9%	12.7%	18.6%	12.7%	11.9%
	No	Count	142	213	55	57	233	700
		% within metro area	91.0%	89.1%	87.3%	81.4%	87.3%	88.1%
Total		Count	156	239	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Implement a state income	Yes	Count	16	11	5	12	1	2	1	48
tax on individuals		% within libcon	34.8%	19.3%	8.6%	5.2%	.9%	1.2%	.8%	6.0%
	No	Count	30	46	53	219	111	163	125	747
		% within libcon	65.2%	80.7%	91.4%	94.8%	99.1%	98.8%	99.2%	94.0%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	165	126	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

7 point Party ID

|--|

			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	
Implement a state income	Yes	Count	21	6	10	5	2	3	2	1	50
tax on individuals		% within 7 point Party ID	12.5%	7.5%	19.6%	5.4%	1.6%	4.5%	1.0%	8.3%	6.3%
	No	Count	147	74	41	87	122	63	194	11	739
		% within 7 point Party ID	87.5%	92.5%	80.4%	94.6%	98.4%	95.5%	99.0%	91.7%	93.7%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	124	66	196	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * age Crosstabulation

			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Implement a state income tax	Yes	Count	6	16	21	7	50
on individuals		% within age	4.6%	7.4%	6.4%	5.6%	6.3%
	No	Count	125	201	306	118	750
		% within age	95.4%	92.6%	93.6%	94.4%	93.8%
Total		Count	131	217	327	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * Education Crosstabulation

				Education					
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Implement a state income	Yes	Count	4	8	14	9	7	7	49
tax on individuals		% within Education	12.5%	2.7%	5.8%	11.7%	6.6%	15.9%	6.1%
	No	Count	28	292	226	68	99	37	750
		% within Education	87.5%	97.3%	94.2%	88.3%	93.4%	84.1%	93.9%
Total		Count	32	300	240	77	106	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

		Religious attendance					
	More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a			
	a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total	
Implement a state income Yes Count	4	4	3	15	24	50	

tax on individuals		% within Religious attendance	2.9%	3.2%	3.4%	6.9%	10.3%	6.3%
	No	Count	134	122	85	201	208	750
		% within Religious attendance	97.1%	96.8%	96.6%	93.1%	89.7%	93.8%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Implement a state income	Yes	Count	34	2	10	2	0	2	1	51
tax on individuals		% within Race	6.7%	2.1%	6.9%	20.0%	.0%	13.3%	4.2%	6.4%
	No	Count	472	95	135	8	5	13	23	751
		% within Race	93.3%	97.9%	93.1%	80.0%	100.0%	86.7%	95.8%	93.6%
Total		Count	506	97	145	10	5	15	24	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Implement a state income	Yes	Count	27	1	10	0	7	5	50
tax on individuals		% within Marital Status	5.9%	7.7%	10.3%	.0%	4.5%	12.5%	6.2%
	No	Count	432	12	87	35	150	35	751
		% within Marital Status	94.1%	92.3%	89.7%	100.0%	95.5%	87.5%	93.8%
Total		Count	459	13	97	35	157	40	801
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Implement a state income tax	Yes	Count	29	21	50
on individuals		% within Gender	7.8%	4.9%	6.3%
	No	Count	344	406	750
		% within Gender	92.2%	95.1%	93.8%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Implement a state income tax	Yes	Count	23	22	5	50
on individuals		% within urban/suburban/rural	10.7%	5.6%	2.6%	6.3%
	No	Count	191	369	184	744
		% within urban/suburban/rural	89.3%	94.4%	97.4%	93.7%
Total		Count	214	391	189	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Implement a state income tax on individuals	* metro area Crosstabulation
---	------------------------------

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort	Yes, I live in the San	Yes, I live in	No, I live in another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Implement a state income	Yes	Count	7	19	3	7	14	50
tax on individuals		% within metro area	4.5%	7.9%	4.8%	10.0%	5.2%	6.3%
	No	Count	148	221	60	63	253	745
		% within metro area	95.5%	92.1%	95.2%	90.0%	94.8%	93.7%
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

l do	o not sup	port any o	f these	e measures	s * libcon	Crossta	bulat	lion
------	-----------	------------	---------	------------	------------	---------	-------	------

libcon	Total

			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	
I do not support any of	Yes	Count	5	4	0	26	7	23	24	89
these measures		% within libcon	10.9%	7.0%	.0%	11.3%	6.3%	14.0%	19.0%	11.2%
	No	Count	41	53	58	205	105	141	102	705
		% within libcon	89.1%	93.0%	100.0%	88.7%	93.8%	86.0%	81.0%	88.8%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
I do not support any of	Yes	Count	19	11	0	8	17	7	25	2	89
these measures		% within 7 point Party ID	11.3%	13.8%	.0%	8.7%	13.6%	10.6%	12.8%	16.7%	11.3%
	No	Count	149	69	51	84	108	59	170	10	700
		% within 7 point Party ID	88.7%	86.3%	100.0%	91.3%	86.4%	89.4%	87.2%	83.3%	88.7%
Total		Count	168	80	51	92	125	66	195	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * age Crosstabulation

				а	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
I do not support any of these	Yes	Count	19	15	37	18	89
measures		% within age	14.6%	6.9%	11.3%	14.4%	11.1%
	No	Count	111	203	291	107	712
		% within age	85.4%	93.1%	88.7%	85.6%	88.9%
Total		Count	130	218	328	125	801
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures	* Education	Crosstabulation
--	-------------	-----------------

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
I do not support any of	Yes	Count	4	44	20	10	6	5	89
these measures		% within Education	12.1%	14.6%	8.3%	13.0%	5.6%	11.6%	11.1%

	No	Count	29	257	220	67	101	38	712
		% within Education	87.9%	85.4%	91.7%	87.0%	94.4%	88.4%	88.9%
Total		Count	33	301	240	77	107	43	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Religious attendance						
			More than once A few times a Once or twice a							
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total		
I do not support any of	Yes	Count	17	15	17	26	14	89		
these measures		% within Religious attendance	12.3%	11.8%	19.1%	12.0%	6.1%	11.1%		
	No	Count	121	112	72	191	217	713		
		% within Religious attendance	87.7%	88.2%	80.9%	88.0%	93.9%	88.9%		
Total		Count	138	127	89	217	231	802		
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

I do not support any of these measures * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
I do not support any of	Yes	Count	48	14	20	0	1	1	5	89
these measures		% within Race	9.5%	14.4%	13.9%	.0%	20.0%	6.7%	21.7%	11.1%
	No	Count	459	83	124	10	4	14	18	712
		% within Race	90.5%	85.6%	86.1%	100.0%	80.0%	93.3%	78.3%	88.9%
Total		Count	507	97	144	10	5	15	23	801
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * Marital Status Crosstabulation

	<i>4</i>
Marital Status	Total
	4

			Marriad	Soparated	Divorcod	Widowod	Single	Domestic	
	-	-	Marrieu	Separateu	Divoiceu	Widowed	Single	partifiership	
I do not support any of	Yes	Count	51	4	8	3	19	3	88
these measures		% within Marital Status	11.1%	30.8%	8.3%	8.6%	12.1%	7.5%	11.0%
	No	Count	408	9	88	32	138	37	712
		% within Marital Status	88.9%	69.2%	91.7%	91.4%	87.9%	92.5%	89.0%
Total		Count	459	13	96	35	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
I do not support any of these	Yes	Count	39	49	88
measures		% within Gender	10.5%	11.5%	11.0%
	No	Count	334	378	712
		% within Gender	89.5%	88.5%	89.0%
Total		Count	373	427	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
I do not support any of these	Yes	Count	26	35	22	83
measures		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.1%	9.0%	11.6%	10.5%
	No	Count	188	355	168	711
		% within urban/suburban/rural	87.9%	91.0%	88.4%	89.5%
Total		Count	214	390	190	794
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

I do not support any of these measures * metro area Crosstabulation

		metro area							
Yes, I live in	Yes, I live in Yes, I live the Yes, I live in No, I live in								
the Houston	the Houston Dallas-Fort the San Yes, I live in another part of								
area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total				

I do not support any of	Yes	Count	18	21	7	4	37	87
these measures		% within metro area	11.6%	8.8%	11.1%	5.7%	13.9%	11.0%
	No	Count	137	218	56	66	230	707
		% within metro area	88.4%	91.2%	88.9%	94.3%	86.1%	89.0%
Total		Count	155	239	63	70	267	794
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	30	38	41	99	41	55	33	337
money in th Fund Do not spe	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within libcon	65.2%	66.7%	69.5%	42.9%	36.6%	33.3%	26.4%	42.4%
	Do not spend money in the	Count	14	10	10	50	52	92	82	310
	Rainy Day Fund	% within libcon	30.4%	17.5%	16.9%	21.6%	46.4%	55.8%	65.6%	39.0%
	Don't know	Count	2	9	8	82	19	18	10	148
		% within libcon	4.3%	15.8%	13.6%	35.5%	17.0%	10.9%	8.0%	18.6%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	165	125	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	119	33	33	25	41	28	59	2	340
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within 7 point Party ID	71.3%	41.3%	64.7%	26.9%	32.8%	42.4%	30.6%	16.7%	43.2%
Do no	Do not spend money in the	Count	22	18	11	42	75	25	108	4	305
	Rainy Day Fund	% within 7 point Party ID	13.2%	22.5%	21.6%	45.2%	60.0%	37.9%	56.0%	33.3%	38.8%
	Don't know	Count	26	29	7	26	9	13	26	6	142
		% within 7 point Party ID	15.6%	36.3%	13.7%	28.0%	7.2%	19.7%	13.5%	50.0%	18.0%
Total		Count	167	80	51	93	125	66	193	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * age Crosstabulation

				1			
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	55	84	152	50	341
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within age	42.3%	38.5%	46.6%	40.3%	42.7%

	Do not spend money in the Rainy Day Fund	Count % within age	42 32.3%	93 42.7%	120 36.8%	55 44.4%	310 38.8%
	Don't know	Count	33	41	54	19	147
		% within age	25.4%	18.8%	16.6%	15.3%	18.4%
Total		Count	130	218	326	124	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	۱			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	13	111	96	41	58	22	341
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within Education	39.4%	36.9%	40.0%	53.9%	54.7%	51.2%	42.7%
	Do not spend money in the	Count	14	112	102	27	37	18	310
	Rainy Day Fund	% within Education	42.4%	37.2%	42.5%	35.5%	34.9%	41.9%	38.8%
	Don't know	Count	6	78	42	8	11	3	148
		% within Education	18.2%	25.9%	17.5%	10.5%	10.4%	7.0%	18.5%
Total		Count	33	301	240	76	106	43	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance)		
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	58	59	31	84	109	341
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within Religious attendance	42.0%	46.8%	34.8%	38.9%	47.2%	42.6%
	Do not spend money in	Count	54	51	41	79	86	311
	the Rainy Day Fund	% within Religious attendance	39.1%	40.5%	46.1%	36.6%	37.2%	38.9%
	Don't know	Count	26	16	17	53	36	148
		% within Religious attendance	18.8%	12.7%	19.1%	24.5%	15.6%	18.5%
Total		Count	138	126	89	216	231	800

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	58	59	31	84	109	341
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within Religious attendance	42.0%	46.8%	34.8%	38.9%	47.2%	42.6%
	Do not spend money in	Count	54	51	41	79	86	311
	the Rainy Day Fund	% within Religious attendance	39.1%	40.5%	46.1%	36.6%	37.2%	38.9%
	Don't know	Count	26	16	17	53	36	148
		% within Religious attendance	18.8%	12.7%	19.1%	24.5%	15.6%	18.5%
Total		Count	138	126	89	216	231	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Rainy day fund * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				-
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	203	60	65	4	0	5	4	341
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within Race	40.2%	61.9%	44.8%	44.4%	.0%	33.3%	16.7%	42.7%
	Do not spend money in the	Count	214	14	50	4	3	8	17	310
	Rainy Day Fund	% within Race	42.4%	14.4%	34.5%	44.4%	75.0%	53.3%	70.8%	38.8%
	Don't know	Count	88	23	30	1	1	2	3	148
		% within Race	17.4%	23.7%	20.7%	11.1%	25.0%	13.3%	12.5%	18.5%
Total		Count	505	97	145	9	4	15	24	799
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day	fund * Marital	Status Cro	osstabulation
-----------	----------------	------------	---------------

			Marit	al Status				
						Domestic		
	Married Separated Divorced Widowed Single partnership					partnership	Total	
Rainy day fund Spend some or all of the Count	180	180 3 56 13 69 19						

	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within Marital Status	39.3%	25.0%	58.9%	36.1%	44.2%	47.5%	42.7%
ļ	Do not spend money in the	Count	196	3	27	16	54	13	309
	Rainy Day Fund	% within Marital Status	42.8%	25.0%	28.4%	44.4%	34.6%	32.5%	38.8%
	Don't know	Count	82	6	12	7	33	8	148
		% within Marital Status	17.9%	50.0%	12.6%	19.4%	21.2%	20.0%	18.6%
Total		Count	458	12	95	36	156	40	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Rainy day fund Sp mo	Spend some or all of the	Count	156	186	342
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within Gender	41.9%	43.5%	42.8%
	Do not spend money in the	Count	179	131	310
	Rainy Day Fund	% within Gender	48.1%	30.6%	38.8%
	Don't know	Count	37	111	148
		% within Gender	9.9%	25.9%	18.5%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	101	185	55	341
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within urban/suburban/rural	47.2%	47.6%	29.1%	43.1%
	Do not spend money in the	Count	74	146	89	309
	Rainy Day Fund	% within urban/suburban/rural	34.6%	37.5%	47.1%	39.0%
	Don't know	Count	39	58	45	142
		% within urban/suburban/rural	18.2%	14.9%	23.8%	17.9%
Total		Count	214	389	189	792
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rainy day fund * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Rainy day fund	Spend some or all of the	Count	64	118	31	33	94	340
	money in the Rainy Day Fund	% within metro area	41.0%	49.6%	49.2%	47.8%	35.2%	42.9%
	Do not spend money in	Count	69	77	19	25	116	306
	the Rainy Day Fund	% within metro area	44.2%	32.4%	30.2%	36.2%	43.4%	38.6%
	Don't know	Count	23	43	13	11	57	147
		% within metro area	14.7%	18.1%	20.6%	15.9%	21.3%	18.5%
Total		Count	156	238	63	69	267	793
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	19	24	25	67	22	23	14	194
		% within libcon	41.3%	41.4%	42.4%	29.3%	19.8%	14.0%	11.2%	24.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	13	19	20	73	46	58	44	273
		% within libcon	28.3%	32.8%	33.9%	31.9%	41.4%	35.4%	35.2%	34.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	1	7	7	25	12	33	9	94
		% within libcon	2.2%	12.1%	11.9%	10.9%	10.8%	20.1%	7.2%	11.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	13	5	7	44	23	47	56	195
		% within libcon	28.3%	8.6%	11.9%	19.2%	20.7%	28.7%	44.8%	24.6%
	Don't know	Count	0	3	0	20	8	3	2	36
		% within libcon	.0%	5.2%	.0%	8.7%	7.2%	1.8%	1.6%	4.5%
Total		Count	46	58	59	229	111	164	125	792
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * libcon Crosstabulation

Imm Military * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Party ID										
		Not very				Not very							
	Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong						
	Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total				
Imm Military Strongly support Count	67	19	27	23	20	20	21	2	199				

		% within 7 point Party ID	40.1%	23.8%	52.9%	25.3%	15.9%	30.8%	10.8%	16.7%	25.3%
	Somewhat support	Count	52	32	16	26	55	16	68	2	267
		% within 7 point Party ID	31.1%	40.0%	31.4%	28.6%	43.7%	24.6%	34.9%	16.7%	33.9%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	10	13	1	8	13	13	30	1	89
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.0%	16.3%	2.0%	8.8%	10.3%	20.0%	15.4%	8.3%	11.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	27	14	7	26	34	16	69	2	195
		% within 7 point Party ID	16.2%	17.5%	13.7%	28.6%	27.0%	24.6%	35.4%	16.7%	24.8%
	Don't know	Count	11	2	0	8	4	0	7	5	37
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.6%	2.5%	.0%	8.8%	3.2%	.0%	3.6%	41.7%	4.7%
Total		Count	167	80	51	91	126	65	195	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	35	50	83	30	198
		% within age	26.9%	23.0%	25.5%	24.0%	24.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	34	80	114	46	274
		% within age	26.2%	36.9%	35.0%	36.8%	34.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	19	26	35	15	95
		% within age	14.6%	12.0%	10.7%	12.0%	11.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	31	47	86	30	194
		% within age	23.8%	21.7%	26.4%	24.0%	24.3%
	Don't know	Count	11	14	8	4	37
		% within age	8.5%	6.5%	2.5%	3.2%	4.6%
Total		Count	130	217	326	125	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	7	70	58	19	28	16	198
		% within Education	21.9%	23.3%	24.4%	24.4%	26.4%	36.4%	24.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	14	94	87	30	35	13	273
		% within Education	43.8%	31.2%	36.6%	38.5%	33.0%	29.5%	34.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	7	34	24	12	11	7	95

		% within Education	21.9%	11.3%	10.1%	15.4%	10.4%	15.9%	11.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	4	81	57	16	30	7	195
		% within Education	12.5%	26.9%	23.9%	20.5%	28.3%	15.9%	24.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	22	12	1	2	1	38
		% within Education	.0%	7.3%	5.0%	1.3%	1.9%	2.3%	4.8%
Total		Count	32	301	238	78	106	44	799
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once		A few times a	Once or twice a		
			a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	34	28	24	42	70	198
		% within Religious attendance	24.6%	22.6%	27.6%	19.4%	30.3%	24.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	50	44	21	78	81	274
		% within Religious attendance	36.2%	35.5%	24.1%	35.9%	35.1%	34.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	13	14	16	32	18	93
		% within Religious attendance	9.4%	11.3%	18.4%	14.7%	7.8%	11.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	37	31	24	49	54	195
		% within Religious attendance	26.8%	25.0%	27.6%	22.6%	23.4%	24.5%
	Don't know	Count	4	7	2	16	8	37
		% within Religious attendance	2.9%	5.6%	2.3%	7.4%	3.5%	4.6%
Total		Count	138	124	87	217	231	797
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * Race Crosstabulation

Race	Total

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	119	22	47	1	0	6	2	197
		% within Race	23.6%	22.9%	32.6%	11.1%	.0%	40.0%	8.7%	24.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	184	27	46	3	0	6	7	273
		% within Race	36.4%	28.1%	31.9%	33.3%	.0%	40.0%	30.4%	34.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	50	16	20	1	0	0	7	94
		% within Race	9.9%	16.7%	13.9%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	30.4%	11.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	129	27	23	2	4	3	7	195
		% within Race	25.5%	28.1%	16.0%	22.2%	100.0%	20.0%	30.4%	24.5%
	Don't know	Count	23	4	8	2	0	0	0	37
		% within Race	4.6%	4.2%	5.6%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.6%
Total		Count	505	96	144	9	4	15	23	796
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	120	1	20	14	33	10	198
		% within Marital Status	26.2%	8.3%	20.6%	38.9%	21.0%	25.0%	24.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	160	5	44	9	46	10	274
		% within Marital Status	34.9%	41.7%	45.4%	25.0%	29.3%	25.0%	34.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	55	4	6	4	18	7	94
		% within Marital Status	12.0%	33.3%	6.2%	11.1%	11.5%	17.5%	11.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	101	2	25	9	47	12	196
		% within Marital Status	22.1%	16.7%	25.8%	25.0%	29.9%	30.0%	24.5%
	Don't know	Count	22	0	2	0	13	1	38
		% within Marital Status	4.8%	.0%	2.1%	.0%	8.3%	2.5%	4.8%
Total		Count	458	12	97	36	157	40	800
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	91	108	199
		% within Gender	24.5%	25.3%	24.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	131	142	273
		% within Gender	35.3%	33.3%	34.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	39	55	94
		% within Gender	10.5%	12.9%	11.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	102	93	195
		% within Gender	27.5%	21.8%	24.4%
	Don't know	Count	8	29	37
		% within Gender	2.2%	6.8%	4.6%
Total		Count	371	427	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	63	97	38	198
		% within urban/suburban/rural	29.4%	25.0%	20.0%	25.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	67	147	60	274
		% within urban/suburban/rural	31.3%	37.9%	31.6%	34.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	25	54	10	89
		% within urban/suburban/rural	11.7%	13.9%	5.3%	11.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	47	79	68	194
		% within urban/suburban/rural	22.0%	20.4%	35.8%	24.5%
	Don't know	Count	12	11	14	37
		% within urban/suburban/rural	5.6%	2.8%	7.4%	4.7%
Total		Count	214	388	190	792
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Military * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Imm Military	Strongly support	Count	43	55	13	20	67	198
		% within metro area	27.7%	23.0%	21.0%	28.6%	25.2%	25.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	49	91	24	27	78	269
		% within metro area	31.6%	38.1%	38.7%	38.6%	29.3%	34.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	15	33	6	10	29	93
		% within metro area	9.7%	13.8%	9.7%	14.3%	10.9%	11.7%
	Strongly oppose	Count	41	48	15	13	78	195
		% within metro area	26.5%	20.1%	24.2%	18.6%	29.3%	24.6%
	Don't know	Count	7	12	4	0	14	37
		% within metro area	4.5%	5.0%	6.5%	.0%	5.3%	4.7%
Total		Count	155	239	62	70	266	792
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	22	21	21	42	12	6	3	127
		% within libcon	46.8%	36.8%	36.2%	18.3%	10.7%	3.7%	2.4%	16.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	7	23	11	63	25	13	14	156
		% within libcon	14.9%	40.4%	19.0%	27.4%	22.3%	7.9%	11.1%	19.6%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	1	5	7	37	20	30	4	104
		% within libcon	2.1%	8.8%	12.1%	16.1%	17.9%	18.3%	3.2%	13.1%
	Strongly oppose	Count	16	7	16	61	48	110	102	360
		% within libcon	34.0%	12.3%	27.6%	26.5%	42.9%	67.1%	81.0%	45.3%
	Don't know	Count	1	1	3	27	7	5	3	47
		% within libcon	2.1%	1.8%	5.2%	11.7%	6.3%	3.0%	2.4%	5.9%
Total		Count	47	57	58	230	112	164	126	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

	7 point Party ID								
Strong	Not very	Loon		Loop	Not very	Strong			
Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total	

Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	60	15	15	15	6	14	4	1	130
		% within 7 point Party ID	35.7%	19.0%	28.8%	16.5%	4.8%	20.9%	2.1%	10.0%	16.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	43	17	20	17	22	11	21	1	152
		% within 7 point Party ID	25.6%	21.5%	38.5%	18.7%	17.5%	16.4%	10.8%	10.0%	19.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	8	23	7	9	19	11	24	3	104
		% within 7 point Party ID	4.8%	29.1%	13.5%	9.9%	15.1%	16.4%	12.3%	30.0%	13.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	44	20	7	41	78	28	138	1	357
		% within 7 point Party ID	26.2%	25.3%	13.5%	45.1%	61.9%	41.8%	70.8%	10.0%	45.3%
	Don't know	Count	13	4	3	9	1	3	8	4	45
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.7%	5.1%	5.8%	9.9%	.8%	4.5%	4.1%	40.0%	5.7%
Total		Count	168	79	52	. 91	126	67	195	10	788
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	33	37	45	15	130
		% within age	25.4%	17.1%	13.8%	12.0%	16.3%
	Somewhat support	Count	28	42	56	29	155
		% within age	21.5%	19.4%	17.2%	23.2%	19.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	16	24	48	17	105
		% within age	12.3%	11.1%	14.7%	13.6%	13.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	42	99	161	59	361
		% within age	32.3%	45.6%	49.4%	47.2%	45.2%
	Don't know	Count	11	15	16	5	47
		% within age	8.5%	6.9%	4.9%	4.0%	5.9%
Total		Count	130	217	326	125	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			N 110	High school	0	0			T ()
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	lotal
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	4	39	44	10	20	13	130

	-	% within Education	12.1%	13.0%	18.4%	13.0%	19.0%	29.5%	16.3%
	Somewhat support	Count	10	52	45	17	22	10	156
		% within Education	30.3%	17.3%	18.8%	22.1%	21.0%	22.7%	19.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	8	44	27	7	15	4	105
		% within Education	24.2%	14.7%	11.3%	9.1%	14.3%	9.1%	13.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	11	136	111	41	45	16	360
		% within Education	33.3%	45.3%	46.4%	53.2%	42.9%	36.4%	45.1%
	Don't know	Count	0	29	12	2	3	1	47
		% within Education	.0%	9.7%	5.0%	2.6%	2.9%	2.3%	5.9%
Total		Count	33	300	239	77	105	44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	19	18	10	30	55	132
		% within Religious attendance	13.7%	14.4%	11.4%	13.8%	23.7%	16.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	30	19	25	32	50	156
		% within Religious attendance	21.6%	15.2%	28.4%	14.7%	21.6%	19.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	16	16	16	37	20	105
	% within Religious attendance	% within Religious attendance	11.5%	12.8%	18.2%	17.1%	8.6%	13.1%
	Strongly oppose	Count	69	67	36	101	88	361
		% within Religious attendance	49.6%	53.6%	40.9%	46.5%	37.9%	45.1%
	Don't know	Count	5	5	1	17	19	47
		% within Religious attendance	3.6%	4.0%	1.1%	7.8%	8.2%	5.9%
Total		Count	139	125	88	217	232	801
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	67	19	36	4	0	3	2	131
		% within Race	13.3%	19.6%	24.8%	40.0%	.0%	20.0%	8.7%	16.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	79	24	42	2	0	3	5	155
		% within Race	15.6%	24.7%	29.0%	20.0%	.0%	20.0%	21.7%	19.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	59	12	26	4	0	0	3	104
		% within Race	11.7%	12.4%	17.9%	40.0%	.0%	.0%	13.0%	13.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	267	39	30	0	5	8	13	362
		% within Race	52.9%	40.2%	20.7%	.0%	100.0%	53.3%	56.5%	45.3%
	Don't know	Count	33	3	11	0	0	1	0	48
		% within Race	6.5%	3.1%	7.6%	.0%	.0%	6.7%	.0%	6.0%
Total		Count	505	97	145	10	5	15	23	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
								Domestic	
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	69	1	15	7	33	6	131
		% within Marital Status	15.1%	7.7%	15.6%	19.4%	21.2%	15.4%	16.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	81	1	26	9	31	8	156
		% within Marital Status	17.7%	7.7%	27.1%	25.0%	19.9%	20.5%	19.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	60	4	9	5	19	6	103
		% within Marital Status	13.1%	30.8%	9.4%	13.9%	12.2%	15.4%	12.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	222	7	43	14	58	18	362
		% within Marital Status	48.5%	53.8%	44.8%	38.9%	37.2%	46.2%	45.4%
	Don't know	Count	26	0	3	1	15	1	46
		% within Marital Status	5.7%	.0%	3.1%	2.8%	9.6%	2.6%	5.8%
Total		Count	458	13	96	36	156	39	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

			Gen	der	-
			Male	Female	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	55	76	131
		% within Gender	14.8%	17.8%	16.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	62	93	155
		% within Gender	16.7%	21.8%	19.4%
Somewhat oppose Count		52	52	104	
		% within Gender	14.0%	12.2%	13.0%
	Strongly oppose	Count	190	171	361
		% within Gender	51.2%	40.0%	45.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	35	47
		% within Gender	3.2%	8.2%	5.9%
Total		Count	371	427	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * Gender Crosstabulation

Imm Education * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	56	59	16	131
		% within urban/suburban/rural	26.2%	15.2%	8.4%	16.5%
	Somewhat support	Count	34	86	35	155
		% within urban/suburban/rural	15.9%	22.1%	18.4%	19.5%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	35	46	19	100
		% within urban/suburban/rural	16.4%	11.8%	10.0%	12.6%
	Strongly oppose	Count	78	178	104	360
		% within urban/suburban/rural	36.4%	45.8%	54.7%	45.4%
	Don't know	Count	11	20	16	47
		% within urban/suburban/rural	5.1%	5.1%	8.4%	5.9%
Total		Count	214	389	190	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Education * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total
	-

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Imm Education	Strongly support	Count	22	37	9	17	46	131
		% within metro area	14.1%	15.5%	13.8%	24.3%	17.2%	16.4%
	Somewhat support	Count	32	53	14	14	44	157
		% within metro area	20.5%	22.3%	21.5%	20.0%	16.4%	19.7%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	20	25	8	8	39	100
		% within metro area	12.8%	10.5%	12.3%	11.4%	14.6%	12.5%
	Strongly oppose	Count	71	110	29	26	126	362
		% within metro area	45.5%	46.2%	44.6%	37.1%	47.0%	45.4%
	Don't know	Count	11	13	5	5	13	47
		% within metro area	7.1%	5.5%	7.7%	7.1%	4.9%	5.9%
Total		Count	156	238	65	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	28	30	23	52	6	7	3	149
		% within libcon	59.6%	51.7%	38.3%	22.7%	5.4%	4.2%	2.4%	18.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	7	17	16	55	17	17	16	145
		% within libcon	14.9%	29.3%	26.7%	24.0%	15.3%	10.3%	12.7%	18.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	6	6	5	34	23	32	7	113
		% within libcon	12.8%	10.3%	8.3%	14.8%	20.7%	19.4%	5.6%	14.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	6	3	15	61	59	105	97	346
		% within libcon	12.8%	5.2%	25.0%	26.6%	53.2%	63.6%	77.0%	43.5%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	1	27	6	4	3	43
		% within libcon	.0%	3.4%	1.7%	11.8%	5.4%	2.4%	2.4%	5.4%
Total		Count	47	58	60	229	111	165	126	796
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

			7 point Pa	arty ID							
	Not very				Not very						
Strong	strong	Lean		Lean	strong	Strong	1	1			
Democrat	Democrat	Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total			
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	70	15	16	26	8	6	5	1	147
--------------	------------------	---------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
		% within 7 point Party ID		19.2%	32.0%	28.3%	6.4%	9.1%	2.6%	8.3%	18.7%
	Somewhat support	t support Count		24	22	10	15	12	25	2	142
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.0%	30.8%	44.0%	10.9%	12.0%	18.2%	12.8%	16.7%	18.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	25	17	3	12	12	15	23	2	109
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.9%	21.8%	6.0%	13.0%	9.6%	22.7%	11.7%	16.7%	13.9%
	Strongly oppose	Count	27	19	8	34	86	33	136	3	346
		% within 7 point Party ID	16.1%	24.4%	16.0%	37.0%	68.8%	50.0%	69.4%	25.0%	44.0%
	Don't know	Count	14	3	1	10	4	0	7	4	43
		% within 7 point Party ID	8.3%	3.8%	2.0%	10.9%	3.2%	.0%	3.6%	33.3%	5.5%
Total		Count	168	78	50	92	125	66	196	12	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	37	45	52	16	150
		% within age	28.2%	20.9%	15.9%	12.9%	18.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	30	48	50	17	145
		% within age	22.9%	22.3%	15.2%	13.7%	18.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	20	21	52	21	114
		% within age	15.3%	9.8%	15.9%	16.9%	14.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	33	87	160	66	346
		% within age	25.2%	40.5%	48.8%	53.2%	43.4%
	Don't know	Count	11	14	14	4	43
		% within age	8.4%	6.5%	4.3%	3.2%	5.4%
Total		Count	131	215	328	124	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	9	47	44	13	22	15	150
		% within Education	28.1%	15.6%	18.5%	16.9%	20.8%	34.1%	18.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	1	46	49	16	22	11	145
		% within Education	3.1%	15.3%	20.6%	20.8%	20.8%	25.0%	18.2%

	Somewhat oppose	Count	8	51	27	9	16	3	114
		% within Education	25.0%	16.9%	11.3%	11.7%	15.1%	6.8%	14.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	14	134	104	37	43	14	346
		% within Education	43.8%	44.5%	43.7%	48.1%	40.6%	31.8%	43.4%
	Don't know	Count	0	23	14	2	3	1	43
		% within Education	.0%	7.6%	5.9%	2.6%	2.8%	2.3%	5.4%
Total		Count	32	301	238	77	106	44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	19	18	13	41	59	150
		% within Religious attendance	13.9%	14.3%	14.9%	18.9%	25.5%	18.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	21	28	21	34	42	146
		% within Religious attendance	15.3%	22.2%	24.1%	15.7%	18.2%	18.3%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	31	12	17	28	25	113
		% within Religious attendance	22.6%	9.5%	19.5%	12.9%	10.8%	14.2%
	Strongly oppose	Count	60	61	33	99	92	345
		% within Religious attendance	43.8%	48.4%	37.9%	45.6%	39.8%	43.2%
	Don't know	Count	6	7	3	15	13	44
		% within Religious attendance	4.4%	5.6%	3.4%	6.9%	5.6%	5.5%
Total		Count	137	126	87	217	231	798
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * Race Crosstabulation

	Race	Total						
	r	1						

			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó nativo	Mixed	Other	
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	70	23	47	3	0	6	2	151
		% within Race	13.9%	23.7%	32.6%	33.3%	.0%	40.0%	8.7%	18.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	84	14	35	3	0	2	6	144
		% within Race	16.6%	14.4%	24.3%	33.3%	.0%	13.3%	26.1%	18.0%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	62	22	20	3	0	3	4	114
		% within Race	12.3%	22.7%	13.9%	33.3%	.0%	20.0%	17.4%	14.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	258	34	34	0	5	3	11	345
		% within Race	51.1%	35.1%	23.6%	.0%	100.0%	20.0%	47.8%	43.2%
	Don't know	Count	31	4	8	0	0	1	0	44
		% within Race	6.1%	4.1%	5.6%	.0%	.0%	6.7%	.0%	5.5%
Total		Count	505	97	144	9	5	15	23	798
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	77	0	17	5	42	8	149
		% within Marital Status	16.8%	.0%	17.9%	14.3%	26.9%	20.5%	18.7%
	Somewhat support	Count	83	2	21	3	30	6	145
		% within Marital Status	18.2%	15.4%	22.1%	8.6%	19.2%	15.4%	18.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	60	4	22	6	16	6	114
		% within Marital Status	13.1%	30.8%	23.2%	17.1%	10.3%	15.4%	14.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	217	6	33	18	52	19	345
		% within Marital Status	47.5%	46.2%	34.7%	51.4%	33.3%	48.7%	43.4%
	Don't know	Count	20	1	2	3	16	0	42
		% within Marital Status	4.4%	7.7%	2.1%	8.6%	10.3%	.0%	5.3%
Total		Count	457	13	95	35	156	39	795
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	68	82	150
		% within Gender	18.2%	19.3%	18.8%
	Somewhat support	Count	59	86	145
		% within Gender	15.8%	20.2%	18.2%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	51	63	114
		% within Gender	13.7%	14.8%	14.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	186	160	346
		% within Gender	49.9%	37.6%	43.4%
	Don't know	Count	9	34	43
		% within Gender	2.4%	8.0%	5.4%
Total		Count	373	425	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	-
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	60	69	21	150
		% within urban/suburban/rural	28.0%	17.8%	11.2%	19.0%
	Somewhat support	Count	34	81	30	145
		% within urban/suburban/rural	15.9%	20.9%	16.0%	18.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	28	60	21	109
		% within urban/suburban/rural	13.1%	15.5%	11.2%	13.8%
	Strongly oppose	Count	76	163	105	344
		% within urban/suburban/rural	35.5%	42.0%	55.9%	43.5%
	Don't know	Count	16	15	11	42
		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.5%	3.9%	5.9%	5.3%
Total		Count	214	388	188	790
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm Overhaul * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Imm Overhaul	Strongly support	Count	31	50	8	18	42	149
		% within metro area	20.0%	21.1%	12.9%	26.1%	15.7%	18.9%
	Somewhat support	Count	28	39	16	16	46	145
		% within metro area	18.1%	16.5%	25.8%	23.2%	17.2%	18.4%
	Somewhat oppose	Count	19	37	9	13	35	113
		% within metro area	12.3%	15.6%	14.5%	18.8%	13.1%	14.3%
	Strongly oppose	Count	67	99	25	21	129	341
		% within metro area	43.2%	41.8%	40.3%	30.4%	48.3%	43.2%
	Don't know	Count	10	12	4	1	15	42
		% within metro area	6.5%	5.1%	6.5%	1.4%	5.6%	5.3%
Total		Count	155	237	62	69	267	790
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Local enforcement of	Local law enforcement	Count	9	7	12	63	49	82	87	309
Federal immigration laws	officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within libcon	19.6%	12.5%	21.1%	27.4%	44.1%	50.0%	69.0%	39.1%
	Local law enforcement	Count	14	18	32	82	52	75	31	304
officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within libcon	30.4%	32.1%	56.1%	35.7%	46.8%	45.7%	24.6%	38.5%	
	Cities and counties should	Count	19	18	12	32	4	4	5	94
	be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within libcon	41.3%	32.1%	21.1%	13.9%	3.6%	2.4%	4.0%	11.9%
	Don't know	Count	4	13	1	53	6	3	3	83
		% within libcon	8.7%	23.2%	1.8%	23.0%	5.4%	1.8%	2.4%	10.5%
Total		Count	46	56	57	230	111	164	126	790
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws	Local law enforcement officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	Count % within 7 point Party ID	34 20.4%	26 32.5%	12 24.0%	24 25.8%	65 52.0%	29 43.3%	117 59.7%	1 8.3%	308 39.0%
Local law officials s to enforc immigrati should no	Local law enforcement officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	Count % within 7 point Party ID	62 37.1%	25 31.3%	21 42.0%	39 41.9%	57 45.6%	27 40.3%	68 34.7%	4 33.3%	303 38.4%
	Cities and counties should be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	Count % within 7 point Party ID	36 21.6%	17 21.3%	10 20.0%	18 19.4%	2 1.6%	6 9.0%	7 3.6%	0 .0%	96 12.2%
	Don't know	Count % within 7 point Party ID	35 21.0%	12 15.0%	7 14.0%	12 12.9%	1 .8%	5 7.5%	4	7 58.3%	83 10.5%
Total		Count % within 7 point Party ID	167 100.0%	80 100.0%	50 100.0%	93 100.0%	125 100.0%	67 100.0%	196 100.0%	12 100.0%	790

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Local enforcement of	of Federal	l immigration l	laws * age (Crosstabulation
----------------------	------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Local enforcement of Federal	Local law enforcement officials	Count	39	80	141	51	311
mmigration laws	should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within age	29.8%	36.7%	43.3%	40.8%	38.9%
	Local law enforcement officials	Count	37	87	122	60	306
	should be allowed to enforce g federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within age	28.2%	39.9%	37.4%	48.0%	38.3%
	Cities and counties should be	Count	25	26	38	8	97
	allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within age	19.1%	11.9%	11.7%	6.4%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	30	25	25	6	86
		% within age	22.9%	11.5%	7.7%	4.8%	10.8%
Total		Count	131	218	326	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws	Local law enforcement officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	Count % within Education	13 39.4%	125 41.9%	90 37.7%	33 42.3%	37 34.9%	12 27.3%	310 38.8%
	Local law enforcement officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	Count % within Education	13 39.4%	93 31.2%	98 41.0%	28 35.9%	49 46.2%	24 54.5%	305 38.2%
	Cities and counties should be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	Count % within Education	2 6.1%	36 12.1%	31 13.0%	11 14.1%	12 11.3%	5 11.4%	97 12.2%
	Don't know	Count	5	44	20	6	8	3	86 10 8%
Total		Count	33	14.8%	8.4% 239	7.7%	106	6.8% 44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than	0	A few times a	Once or twice a	Nerre	Tatal
			once a week	Once a week	month	year	Never	lotal
Local enforcement of	Local law enforcement	Count	60	53	25	87	86	311
Federal immigration laws	officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within Religious attendance	43.5%	42.1%	28.4%	40.5%	37.2%	39.0%
	Local law enforcement	Count	55	51	36	69	94	305
	officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within Religious attendance	39.9%	40.5%	40.9%	32.1%	40.7%	38.2%
	Cities and counties should	Count	9	14	11	35	28	97
	be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within Religious attendance	6.5%	11.1%	12.5%	16.3%	12.1%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	14	8	16	24	23	85
		% within Religious attendance	10.1%	6.3%	18.2%	11.2%	10.0%	10.7%
Total		Count	138	126	88	215	231	798

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Local enforcement of	Local law enforcement	Count	60	53	25	87	86	311
Federal immigration laws	officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within Religious attendance	43.5%	42.1%	28.4%	40.5%	37.2%	39.0%
	Local law enforcement	Count	55	51	36	69	94	305
	officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within Religious attendance	39.9%	40.5%	40.9%	32.1%	40.7%	38.2%
	Cities and counties should	Count	9	14	11	35	28	97
	be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within Religious attendance	6.5%	11.1%	12.5%	16.3%	12.1%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	14	8	16	24	23	85
		% within Religious attendance	10.1%	6.3%	18.2%	11.2%	10.0%	10.7%
Total		Count	138	126	88	215	231	798
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws	* Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Local enforcement of Federal Immigration laws * Race Crosstabulation										
						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Local enforcement of	Local law enforcement	Count	233	31	26	2	5	4	10	311
Federal immigration laws of to immigration laws	officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within Race	46.0%	32.0%	17.9%	22.2%	100.0%	28.6%	41.7%	38.9%
	Local law enforcement	Count	196	38	57	1	0	7	6	305
	officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within Race	38.7%	39.2%	39.3%	11.1%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	38.1%
	Cities and counties should	Count	44	6	40	2	0	2	3	97

nt of Endoral immigration lows * Bass Crosstabulativ . al anfa

	be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within Race	8.7%	6.2%	27.6%	22.2%	.0%	14.3%	12.5%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	33	22	22	4	0	1	5	87
		% within Race	6.5%	22.7%	15.2%	44.4%	.0%	7.1%	20.8%	10.9%
Total		Count	506	97	145	9	5	14	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Local enforcement of	Local law enforcement	Count	181	4	43	17	44	22	311
Federal immigration laws	officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within Marital Status	39.3%	33.3%	45.3%	47.2%	28.2%	55.0%	38.9%
	Local law enforcement	Count	176	8	37	15	59	10	305
	officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within Marital Status	38.3%	66.7%	38.9%	41.7%	37.8%	25.0%	38.2%
	Cities and counties should	Count	53	0	13	3	23	5	97
	be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within Marital Status	11.5%	.0%	13.7%	8.3%	14.7%	12.5%	12.1%
	Don't know	Count	50	0	2	1	30	3	86
		% within Marital Status	10.9%	.0%	2.1%	2.8%	19.2%	7.5%	10.8%
Total		Count	460	12	95	36	156	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Local enforcement of Federal	Local law enforcement officials	Count	150	160	310
immigration laws	should be required to actively enforce federal immigration	% within Gender	40.4%	37.5%	38.8%
	laws.				
	Local law enforcement officials	Count	152	154	306

	should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within Gender	41.0%	36.1%	38.3%
	Cities and counties should be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	Count % within Gender	53 14.3%	43 10.1%	96 12.0%
	Don't know	Count	16	70	86
		% within Gender	4.3%	16.4%	10.8%
Total		Count	371	427	798
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Local enforcement of Federal	Local law enforcement officials	Count	64	159	87	310
immigration laws	should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within urban/suburban/rural	30.0%	40.7%	46.0%	39.1%
	Local law enforcement officials	Count	76	156	73	305
	should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within urban/suburban/rural	35.7%	39.9%	38.6%	38.5%
	Cities and counties should be	Count	42	44	11	97
	allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within urban/suburban/rural	19.7%	11.3%	5.8%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	31	32	18	81
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.6%	8.2%	9.5%	10.2%
Total		Count	213	391	189	793
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Local enforcement of Federal immigration laws * metro area Crosstabulation

metro area	Total
	·

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Local enforcement of	Local law enforcement	Count	70	88	19	28	106	311
Federal immigration laws	officials should be required to actively enforce federal immigration laws.	% within metro area	45.2%	36.7%	29.2%	40.0%	39.8%	39.1%
	Local law enforcement	Count	56	96	24	24	101	301
	officials should be allowed to enforce federal immigration laws, but it should not be a primary re	% within metro area	36.1%	40.0%	36.9%	34.3%	38.0%	37.8%
	Cities and counties should	Count	17	30	11	13	26	97
	be allowed to restrict local law enforcement officials from enforcing federal immigration law	% within metro area	11.0%	12.5%	16.9%	18.6%	9.8%	12.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	26	11	5	33	87
		% within metro area	7.7%	10.8%	16.9%	7.1%	12.4%	10.9%
Total		Count	155	240	65	70	266	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely						Extremely	
			liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	30	46	36	101	33	51	37	334
		% within libcon	65.2%	80.7%	61.0%	43.7%	29.5%	31.1%	29.6%	42.1%
	Bad thing	Count	6	5	17	85	59	97	79	348
		% within libcon	13.0%	8.8%	28.8%	36.8%	52.7%	59.1%	63.2%	43.8%
	Don't know	Count	10	6	6	45	20	16	9	112
		% within libcon	21.7%	10.5%	10.2%	19.5%	17.9%	9.8%	7.2%	14.1%
Total		Count	46	57	59	231	112	164	125	794
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong	Not very strong			Lean	Not very strong	Strong		
				Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	100	33	38	39	51	24	48	2	335
		% within 7 point Party ID	59.5%	40.7%	73.1%	41.9%	41.1%	35.8%	24.5%	15.4%	42.2%

	Bad thing	Count	40	33	11	33	61	37	132	6	353
	% within 7 point Party ID		23.8%	40.7%	21.2%	35.5%	49.2%	55.2%	67.3%	46.2%	44.5%
	Don't know	Count	28	15	3	21	12	6	16	5	106
		% within 7 point Party ID	16.7%	18.5%	5.8%	22.6%	9.7%	9.0%	8.2%	38.5%	13.4%
Total		Count	168	81	52	93	124	67	196	13	794
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	57	93	143	44	337
		% within age	43.8%	42.9%	43.6%	35.2%	42.1%
	Bad thing	Count	46	84	154	68	352
		% within age	35.4%	38.7%	47.0%	54.4%	44.0%
	Don't know	Count	27	40	31	13	111
		% within age	20.8%	18.4%	9.5%	10.4%	13.9%
Total		Count	130	217	328	125	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior	ו			
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	11	106	102	35	53	30	337
		% within Education	34.4%	35.2%	42.5%	45.5%	49.5%	68.2%	42.1%
	Bad thing	Count	16	141	103	38	42	12	352
		% within Education	50.0%	46.8%	42.9%	49.4%	39.3%	27.3%	43.9%
	Don't know	Count	5	54	35	4	12	2	112
		% within Education	15.6%	17.9%	14.6%	5.2%	11.2%	4.5%	14.0%
Total		Count	32	301	240	77	107	44	801
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Religious attendance	Total

			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count % within Religious attendance	54 39.1%	50 39.7%	47 52.8%	83 38.4%	102 44.2%	336 42.0%
	Bad thing	Count % within Religious attendance	66 47.8%	60 47.6%	31 34.8%	99 45.8%	95 41.1%	351 43.9%
	Don't know	Count % within Religious attendance	18 13.0%	16 12.7%	11 12.4%	34 15.7%	34 14.7%	113 14.1%
Total		Count % within Religious attendance	138 100.0%	126 100.0%	89 100.0%	216 100.0%	231 100.0%	800 100.0%

Imm. approval * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena ó			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	193	37	85	5	0	7	8	335
		% within Race	38.1%	38.1%	59.0%	50.0%	.0%	46.7%	33.3%	41.9%
	Bad thing	Count	252	42	30	5	4	6	14	353
		% within Race	49.8%	43.3%	20.8%	50.0%	100.0%	40.0%	58.3%	44.1%
	Don't know	Count	61	18	29	0	0	2	2	112
		% within Race	12.1%	18.6%	20.1%	.0%	.0%	13.3%	8.3%	14.0%
Total		Count	506	97	144	10	4	15	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * Marital Status Crosstabulation

		Marital Status							
	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total		
		-	2			po			
Imm. approval Good thing Count 186 5 42 13 74 16							336		

	-	% within Marital Status	40.6%	38.5%	43.8%	36.1%	47.4%	40.0%	42.1%
	Bad thing	Count	215	8	37	19	55	18	352
		% within Marital Status	46.9%	61.5%	38.5%	52.8%	35.3%	45.0%	44.1%
	Don't know	Count	57	0	17	4	27	6	111
		% within Marital Status	12.4%	.0%	17.7%	11.1%	17.3%	15.0%	13.9%
Total		Count	458	13	96	36	156	40	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	188	148	336
		% within Gender	50.5%	34.6%	42.0%
	Bad thing	Count	149	203	352
		% within Gender	40.1%	47.4%	44.0%
	Don't know	Count	35	77	112
		% within Gender	9.4%	18.0%	14.0%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	104	177	56	337
		% within urban/suburban/rural	48.4%	45.3%	29.5%	42.3%
	Bad thing	Count	83	168	100	351
		% within urban/suburban/rural	38.6%	43.0%	52.6%	44.1%
	Don't know	Count	28	46	34	108
		% within urban/suburban/rural	13.0%	11.8%	17.9%	13.6%
Total		Count	215	391	190	796
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Imm. approval * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Imm. approval	Good thing	Count	70	106	24	37	95	332
		% within metro area	45.2%	44.2%	38.1%	52.9%	35.6%	41.8%
	Bad thing	Count	69	97	28	27	131	352
		% within metro area	44.5%	40.4%	44.4%	38.6%	49.1%	44.3%
	Don't know	Count	16	37	11	6	41	111
		% within metro area	10.3%	15.4%	17.5%	8.6%	15.4%	14.0%
Total		Count	155	240	63	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon			T. T	· /
			Extremely	2		In the middle4	5	6	Extremely	Total
<u> </u>		/		ب	ب		ہےتے	ليسقسم	CONSErvativer	
Rep race	Very Important	Count	21	1 01	¹ 1	131	21	5	31	26
		% within libcon	4.3%	.0%	1.7%	5.6%	1.8%	3.0%	2.4%	3.3%
	Somewhat Important	Count	1	1	6	37	6	14	13	78
1		% within libcon	2.2%	1.9%	10.3%	16.0%	5.4%	8.5%	10.5%	9.9%
	Not at all Important	Count	43	50	51	163	102	144	107	660
		% within libcon	93.5%	94.3%	87.9%	70.6%	91.1%	87.3%	86.3%	83.7%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	0	18	2	2	1	25
		% within libcon	.0%	3.8%	.0%	7.8%	1.8%	1.2%	.8%	3.2%
Total		Count	46	53	58	231	112	165	124	789
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	13	2	0	1	3	2	7	0	28
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.9%	2.5%	.0%	1.1%	2.4%	3.0%	3.6%	.0%	3.6%
	Somewhat Important	Count	14	13	4	12	11	3	21	1	79
		% within 7 point Party ID	8.5%	16.3%	7.7%	13.0%	8.8%	4.5%	10.8%	7.7%	10.0%
	Not at all Important	Count	127	63	47	75	109	61	164	8	654

		% within 7 point Party ID	77.4%	78.8%	90.4%	81.5%	87.2%	92.4%	84.1%	61.5%	83.1%
	Don't know	Count	10	2	1	4	2	0	3	4	26
		% within 7 point Party ID	6.1%	2.5%	1.9%	4.3%	1.6%	.0%	1.5%	30.8%	3.3%
Total		Count	164	80	52	92	125	66	195	13	787
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* age Crosstabulation

				age 18-29 30-44 45-64 65 & ove 10 9 7 7.6% 4.1% 2.1% 1.7 17 24 32 13.0% 11.1% 9.8% 5.8 94 177 281 1 1 71.8% 81.6% 85.7% 92.6			
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	10	9	7	2	28
		% within age	7.6%	4.1%	2.1%	1.7%	3.5%
	Somewhat Important	Count	17	24	32	7	80
		% within age	13.0%	11.1%	9.8%	5.8%	10.0%
	Not at all Important	Count	94	177	281	112	664
		% within age	71.8%	81.6%	85.7%	92.6%	83.3%
	Don't know	Count	10	7	8	0	25
		% within age	7.6%	3.2%	2.4%	.0%	3.1%
Total		Count	131	217	328	121	797
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* Education Crosstabulation

					Education	l			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	1	12	4	6	5	0	28
		% within Education	3.1%	4.0%	1.7%	7.8%	4.7%	.0%	3.5%
	Somewhat Important	Count	6	33	23	5	7	6	80
		% within Education	18.8%	11.1%	9.6%	6.5%	6.6%	14.0%	10.1%
	Not at all Important	Count	23	238	209	64	90	37	661
		% within Education	71.9%	80.1%	87.1%	83.1%	84.9%	86.0%	83.1%
	Don't know	Count	2	14	4	2	4	0	26
		% within Education	6.3%	4.7%	1.7%	2.6%	3.8%	.0%	3.3%
Total		Count	32	297	240	77	106	43	795
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	9	6	0	9	4	28
		% within Religious attendance	6.5%	4.7%	.0%	4.1%	1.7%	3.5%
	Somewhat Important	Count	9	15	15	26	16	81
	_	% within Religious attendance	6.5%	11.8%	17.6%	12.0%	6.9%	10.2%
	Not at all Important	Count	118	104	65	173	203	663
	_	% within Religious attendance	85.5%	81.9%	76.5%	79.7%	87.9%	83.1%
	Don't know	Count	2	2	5	9	8	26
		% within Religious attendance	1.4%	1.6%	5.9%	4.1%	3.5%	3.3%
Total		Count	138	127	85	217	231	798
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Rep race importance* Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	13	9	2	1	0	0	2	27
•		% within Race	2.6%	9.6%	1.4%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	8.7%	3.4%
	Somewhat Important	Count	36	16	20	2	2	3	1	80
		% within Race	7.1%	17.0%	14.0%	20.0%	50.0%	21.4%	4.3%	10.1%
	Not at all Important	Count	441	68	116	5	2	11	20	663
		% within Race	87.0%	72.3%	81.1%	50.0%	50.0%	78.6%	87.0%	83.4%
	Don't know	Count	17	1	5	2	0	0	0	25
		% within Race	3.4%	1.1%	3.5%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.1%
Total		Count	507	94	143	10	4	14	23	795
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					Marit	al Status			
								Domestic	
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Rep race	ce Very Important Count		10	0	2	2	13	0	27
	% within Marital Status		2.2%	.0%	2.1%	5.7%	8.3%	.0%	3.4%
	Somewhat Important Count		44	2	6	5	17	8	82
		% within Marital Status	9.6%	15.4%	6.3%	14.3%	10.8%	20.0%	10.3%
	Not at all Important	Count	390	11	88	28	114	32	663
		% within Marital Status	85.5%	84.6%	91.7%	80.0%	72.6%	80.0%	83.2%
	Don't know	Count	12	0	0	0	13	0	25
		% within Marital Status	2.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	.0%	3.1%
Total		Count	456	13	96	35	157	40	797
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* Marital Status Crosstabulation

Rep race importance* Gender Crosstabulation

-			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	12	15	27
		% within Gender	3.2%	3.5%	3.4%
	Somewhat Important	Count	34	47	81
		% within Gender	9.1%	11.1%	10.2%
	Not at all Important	Count	321	343	664
		% within Gender	86.1%	80.9%	83.3%
	Don't know	Count	6	19	25
		% within Gender	1.6%	4.5%	3.1%
Total		Count	373	424	797
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urban/suburban/rural			
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Rep race	Very Important	Count	5	17	5	27
		% within urban/suburban/rural	2.4%	4.4%	2.6%	3.4%

	Somewhat Important	Count	15	44	21	80
		% within urban/suburban/rural	7.1%	11.3%	11.1%	10.1%
	Not at all Important	Count	177	323	158	658
		% within urban/suburban/rural	84.3%	82.8%	83.2%	83.3%
	Don't know	Count	13	6	6	25
		% within urban/suburban/rural	6.2%	1.5%	3.2%	3.2%
Total		Count	210	390	190	790
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rep race importance* metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Rep race	ace Very Important Count		6	11	0	1	10	28
		% within metro area	3.8%	4.6%	.0%	1.4%	3.7%	3.5%
	Somewhat Important	Count	18	25	10	1	26	80
		% within metro area	11.5%	10.5%	15.9%	1.4%	9.7%	10.1%
	Not at all Important	Count	126	195	49	66	223	659
		% within metro area	80.8%	82.3%	77.8%	95.7%	83.5%	83.2%
	Don't know	Count	6	6	4	1	8	25
		% within metro area	3.8%	2.5%	6.3%	1.4%	3.0%	3.2%
Total		Count	156	237	63	69	267	792
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon			<u> </u>	ı — – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –
		F	Extremely	·	í	· · ·		1	Extremely	· /
		/	liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	conservative7	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	9	3	4	35	7	25	32	115
5		% within libcon	19.6%	5.3%	6.9%	15.2%	6.3%	15.1%	25.6%	14.5%
	Somewhat agree	Count	7	7	9	37	38	71	59	228
		% within libcon	15.2%	12.3%	15.5%	16.0%	33.9%	42.8%	47.2%	28.7%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	7	15	11	50	38	33	13	167
		% within libcon	15.2%	26.3%	19.0%	21.6%	33.9%	19.9%	10.4%	21.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	21	22	30	55	13	25	16	182
		% within libcon	45.7%	38.6%	51.7%	23.8%	11.6%	15.1%	12.8%	22.9%

	Don't know	Count	2	10	4	54	16	12	5	103
		% within libcon	4.3%	17.5%	6.9%	23.4%	14.3%	7.2%	4.0%	13.0%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	166	125	795
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

-						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	25	8	6	7	18	11	42	1	118
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.9%	10.1%	11.8%	7.6%	14.5%	16.4%	21.4%	8.3%	15.0%
	Somewhat agree	Count	31	13	5	17	58	12	87	3	226
		% within 7 point Party ID	18.5%	16.5%	9.8%	18.5%	46.8%	17.9%	44.4%	25.0%	28.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	34	16	13	23	27	27	25	1	166
		% within 7 point Party ID	20.2%	20.3%	25.5%	25.0%	21.8%	40.3%	12.8%	8.3%	21.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	56	26	19	34	12	7	23	1	178
		% within 7 point Party ID	33.3%	32.9%	37.3%	37.0%	9.7%	10.4%	11.7%	8.3%	22.6%
	Don't know	Count	22	16	8	11	9	10	19	6	101
		% within 7 point Party ID	13.1%	20.3%	15.7%	12.0%	7.3%	14.9%	9.7%	50.0%	12.8%
Total		Count	168	79	51	92	124	67	196	12	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	9	30	51	26	116
		% within age	6.9%	13.8%	15.5%	21.0%	14.5%
	Somewhat agree	Count	29	64	90	46	229
		% within age	22.3%	29.5%	27.4%	37.1%	28.7%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	24	43	80	20	167
0		% within age	18.5%	19.8%	24.4%	16.1%	20.9%
	Strongly disagree	Count	30	47	81	24	182
		% within age	23.1%	21.7%	24.7%	19.4%	22.8%
	Don't know	Count	38	33	26	8	105
		% within age	29.2%	15.2%	7.9%	6.5%	13.1%
Total		Count	130	217	328	124	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	7	45	34	12	16	3	117
		% within Education	21.9%	14.9%	14.2%	15.6%	15.1%	7.0%	14.6%
	Somewhat agree	Count	9	83	67	23	32	15	229
		% within Education	28.1%	27.5%	27.9%	29.9%	30.2%	34.9%	28.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	4	61	54	16	24	8	167
		% within Education	12.5%	20.2%	22.5%	20.8%	22.6%	18.6%	20.9%
	Strongly disagree	Count	7	60	56	23	23	13	182
		% within Education	21.9%	19.9%	23.3%	29.9%	21.7%	30.2%	22.8%
	Don't know	Count	5	53	29	3	11	4	105
		% within Education	15.6%	17.5%	12.1%	3.9%	10.4%	9.3%	13.1%
Total		Count	32	302	240	77	106	43	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	26	22	22	22	24	116
		% within Religious attendance	19.0%	17.5%	25.0%	10.1%	10.3%	14.5%
	Somewhat agree	Count	57	37	23	61	52	230
		% within Religious attendance	41.6%	29.4%	26.1%	28.1%	22.4%	28.7%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	20	32	14	48	52	166
		% within Religious attendance	14.6%	25.4%	15.9%	22.1%	22.4%	20.8%
	Strongly disagree	Count	23	21	19	53	66	182
		% within Religious attendance	16.8%	16.7%	21.6%	24.4%	28.4%	22.8%
	Don't know	Count	11	14	10	33	38	106
		% within Religious attendance	8.0%	11.1%	11.4%	15.2%	16.4%	13.3%
Total		Count	137	126	88	217	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	72	15	23	1	0	1	4	116
		% within Race	14.2%	15.5%	15.9%	10.0%	.0%	6.7%	17.4%	14.5%
	Somewhat agree	Count	155	23	33	2	3	4	9	229
		% within Race	30.6%	23.7%	22.8%	20.0%	75.0%	26.7%	39.1%	28.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	111	21	25	1	1	5	4	168
		% within Race	21.9%	21.6%	17.2%	10.0%	25.0%	33.3%	17.4%	21.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	107	28	37	1	0	3	5	181
		% within Race	21.1%	28.9%	25.5%	10.0%	.0%	20.0%	21.7%	22.6%
	Don't know	Count	61	10	27	5	0	2	1	106
		% within Race	12.1%	10.3%	18.6%	50.0%	.0%	13.3%	4.3%	13.3%
Total		Count	506	97	145	10	4	15	23	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Mari	tal Status			
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	63	6	15	6	21	5	116
		% within Marital Status	13.7%	54.5%	15.8%	16.7%	13.4%	12.5%	14.5%
	Somewhat agree	Count	145	1	23	11	39	10	229
		% within Marital Status	31.6%	9.1%	24.2%	30.6%	24.8%	25.0%	28.7%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	99	1	25	7	27	7	166
1		% within Marital Status	21.6%	9.1%	26.3%	19.4%	17.2%	17.5%	20.8%
	Strongly disagree	Count	98	2	22	9	40	10	181
1		% within Marital Status	21.4%	18.2%	23.2%	25.0%	25.5%	25.0%	22.7%
	Don't know	Count	54	1	10	3	30	8	106
		% within Marital Status	11.8%	9.1%	10.5%	8.3%	19.1%	20.0%	13.3%
Total		Count	459	11	95	36	157	40	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me	* Gender Crosstabulation
--------------------------	--------------------------

Ger	Gender		
Male	Female	Total	

Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	54	63	117
		% within Gender	14.4%	14.8%	14.6%
	Somewhat agree	Count	116	113	229
		% within Gender	31.0%	26.5%	28.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	96	71	167
		% within Gender	25.7%	16.6%	20.8%
	Strongly disagree	Count	89	93	182
		% within Gender	23.8%	21.8%	22.7%
	Don't know	Count	19	87	106
		% within Gender	5.1%	20.4%	13.2%
Total		Count	374	427	801
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	31	53	31	115
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.6%	13.6%	16.3%	14.5%
	Somewhat agree	Count	62	110	57	229
		% within urban/suburban/rural	29.1%	28.3%	30.0%	28.9%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	30	95	41	166
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.1%	24.4%	21.6%	21.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	57	96	29	182
		% within urban/suburban/rural	26.8%	24.7%	15.3%	23.0%
	Don't know	Count	33	35	32	100
		% within urban/suburban/rural	15.5%	9.0%	16.8%	12.6%
Total		Count	213	389	190	792
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Represent people like me * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
				Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in the		No, I live in	
			Yes, I live in the	Dallas-Fort	San Antonio	Yes, I live in the	another part of	
			Houston area.	Worth area	area	Austin area	Texas.	Total
Represent people like me	Strongly agree	Count	24	27	6	10	49	116
		% within metro area	15.6%	11.3%	9.4%	14.3%	18.4%	14.6%

	Somewhat agree	Count	39	70	18	17	81	225
		% within metro area	25.3%	29.2%	28.1%	24.3%	30.3%	28.3%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	39	54	13	18	43	167
		% within metro area	25.3%	22.5%	20.3%	25.7%	16.1%	21.0%
	Strongly disagree	Count	37	54	16	20	55	182
		% within metro area	24.0%	22.5%	25.0%	28.6%	20.6%	22.9%
	Don't know	Count	15	35	11	5	39	105
		% within metro area	9.7%	14.6%	17.2%	7.1%	14.6%	13.2%
Total		Count	154	240	64	70	267	795
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	8	4	2	22	18	35	38	127
		% within libcon	17.0%	7.0%	3.4%	9.5%	16.1%	21.3%	30.4%	16.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	17	21	26	89	42	64	49	308
		% within libcon	36.2%	36.8%	44.1%	38.4%	37.5%	39.0%	39.2%	38.7%
	Not at all important	Count	18	28	26	74	44	47	31	268
		% within libcon	38.3%	49.1%	44.1%	31.9%	39.3%	28.7%	24.8%	33.7%
	Don't know	Count	4	4	5	47	8	18	7	93
		% within libcon	8.5%	7.0%	8.5%	20.3%	7.1%	11.0%	5.6%	11.7%
Total		Count	47	57	59	232	112	164	125	796
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	arty ID				1
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	25	8	5	7	23	6	54	0	128
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.9%	10.0%	9.8%	7.5%	18.4%	9.1%	27.8%	.0%	16.2%
	Somewhat important	Count	62	30	19	34	51	32	73	4	305
		% within 7 point Party ID	36.9%	37.5%	37.3%	36.6%	40.8%	48.5%	37.6%	30.8%	38.6%
	Not at all important	Count	63	31	21	35	44	25	46	4	269
		% within 7 point Party ID	37.5%	38.8%	41.2%	37.6%	35.2%	37.9%	23.7%	30.8%	34.1%
	Don't know	Count	18	11	6	17	7	3	21	5	88
		% within 7 point Party ID	10.7%	13.8%	11.8%	18.3%	5.6%	4.5%	10.8%	38.5%	11.1%
Total		Count	168	80	51	93	125	66	194	13	790
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	18	40	53	17	128
		% within age	13.8%	18.3%	16.2%	13.7%	16.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	53	87	116	52	308
		% within age	40.8%	39.9%	35.4%	41.9%	38.5%
	Not at all important	Count	29	63	129	48	269
		% within age	22.3%	28.9%	39.3%	38.7%	33.6%
	Don't know	Count	30	28	30	7	95
		% within age	23.1%	12.8%	9.1%	5.6%	11.9%
Total		Count	130	218	328	124	800
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * age Crosstabulation

Live people like me * Education Crosstabulation

					Educatior				
				High school		0	4	Deet ared	Tatal
			NO HS	graduate	Some college	z-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	10	51	36	6	18	6	127
		% within Education	30.3%	17.0%	15.1%	7.8%	17.0%	14.0%	15.9%
	Somewhat important	Count	10	109	89	41	46	14	309
		% within Education	30.3%	36.3%	37.2%	53.2%	43.4%	32.6%	38.7%
	Not at all important	Count	7	94	86	27	32	22	268
		% within Education	21.2%	31.3%	36.0%	35.1%	30.2%	51.2%	33.6%
	Don't know	Count	6	46	28	3	10	1	94
		% within Education	18.2%	15.3%	11.7%	3.9%	9.4%	2.3%	11.8%
Total		Count	33	300	239	77	106	43	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * Religious attendance Crosstabulation	
--	--

			Reli	gious attendance				
		More than		A few times a	Once or twice			
once a week Once a week month a year N						Never	Total	
Live people like me Very important	Count	21 20 10 39 38						

		% within Religious attendance	15.2%	15.9%	11.4%	18.1%	16.5%	16.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	55	53	33	82	86	309
		% within Religious attendance	39.9%	42.1%	37.5%	38.0%	37.2%	38.7%
	Not at all important	Count	43	40	28	74	82	267
		% within Religious attendance	31.2%	31.7%	31.8%	34.3%	35.5%	33.4%
	Don't know	Count	19	13	17	21	25	95
		% within Religious attendance	13.8%	10.3%	19.3%	9.7%	10.8%	11.9%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
							Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³			
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	75	22	21	2	3	0	5	128
		% within Race	14.8%	22.4%	14.6%	20.0%	60.0%	.0%	20.8%	16.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	204	33	51	6	1	5	9	309
		% within Race	40.3%	33.7%	35.4%	60.0%	20.0%	33.3%	37.5%	38.5%
	Not at all important	Count	162	30	58	0	1	9	9	269
		% within Race	32.0%	30.6%	40.3%	.0%	20.0%	60.0%	37.5%	33.5%
	Don't know	Count	65	13	14	2	0	1	1	96
		% within Race	12.8%	13.3%	9.7%	20.0%	.0%	6.7%	4.2%	12.0%
Total		Count	506	98	144	10	5	15	24	802
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * Marital Status Crosstabulation

			Marital Status						
							Domestic		
		Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	partnership	Total	
Live people like me Very important	Count	74	0	17	5	25	7	128	

	-	% within Marital Status	16.2%	.0%	17.7%	14.3%	15.8%	17.9%	16.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	173	8	32	17	61	17	308
		% within Marital Status	37.8%	66.7%	33.3%	48.6%	38.6%	43.6%	38.6%
	Not at all important	Count	157	3	39	13	44	12	268
		% within Marital Status	34.3%	25.0%	40.6%	37.1%	27.8%	30.8%	33.6%
	Don't know	Count	54	1	8	0	28	3	94
		% within Marital Status	11.8%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%	17.7%	7.7%	11.8%
Total		Count	458	12	96	35	158	39	798
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	Í
			Male	Female	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	55	73	128
		% within Gender	14.8%	17.1%	16.0%
	Somewhat important	Count	130	179	309
	% within Gender		34.9%	41.8%	38.6%
	Not at all important	Count	162	106	268
		% within Gender	43.5%	24.8%	33.5%
	Don't know	Count	25	70	95
		% within Gender	6.7%	16.4%	11.9%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	42	53	31	126
		% within urban/suburban/rural	19.7%	13.6%	16.4%	15.9%
	Somewhat important	Count	80	165	63	308
		% within urban/suburban/rural	37.6%	42.3%	33.3%	38.9%
	Not at all important	Count	65	135	68	268
		% within urban/suburban/rural	30.5%	34.6%	36.0%	33.8%
	Don't know	Count	26	37	27	90
		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.2%	9.5%	14.3%	11.4%

Total	Count		390	189	792
	% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort	Yes, I live in the San	Yes, I live in the Austin	No, I live in another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	area	Texas.	Total
Live people like me	Very important	Count	23	33	9	16	47	128
		% within metro area	14.8%	13.9%	14.1%	22.9%	17.6%	16.1%
	Somewhat important	Count	51	105	25	28	98	307
		% within metro area	32.9%	44.1%	39.1%	40.0%	36.7%	38.7%
	Not at all important	Count	66	74	20	25	79	264
		% within metro area	42.6%	31.1%	31.3%	35.7%	29.6%	33.2%
	Don't know	Count	15	26	10	1	43	95
		% within metro area	9.7%	10.9%	15.6%	1.4%	16.1%	12.0%
Total		Count	155	238	64	70	267	794
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Live people like me * metro area Crosstabulation

Share preferences * libcon Crosstabulation

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	5	0	4	15	4	5	8	41
		% within libcon	10.9%	.0%	6.9%	6.5%	3.6%	3.0%	6.4%	5.2%
	Somewhat agree	Count	4	14	11	70	34	46	44	223
		% within libcon	8.7%	24.6%	19.0%	30.3%	30.4%	28.0%	35.2%	28.1%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	11	11	20	62	34	52	29	219
		% within libcon	23.9%	19.3%	34.5%	26.8%	30.4%	31.7%	23.2%	27.6%
	Strongly disagree	Count	20	16	19	41	27	40	25	188
		% within libcon	43.5%	28.1%	32.8%	17.7%	24.1%	24.4%	20.0%	23.7%
	Don't know	Count	6	16	4	43	13	21	19	122
		% within libcon	13.0%	28.1%	6.9%	18.6%	11.6%	12.8%	15.2%	15.4%
Total		Count	46	57	58	231	112	164	125	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

-						7 point Pa	arty ID				
			Strong Democrat	Not very strong Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Lean Republican	Not very strong Republican	Strong Republican	Not sure	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	13	4	2	1	3	3	14	0	40
		% within 7 point Party ID	7.8%	5.0%	3.9%	1.1%	2.4%	4.6%	7.1%	.0%	5.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	50	26	11	18	38	16	61	1	221
		% within 7 point Party ID	29.9%	32.5%	21.6%	19.8%	30.2%	24.6%	31.1%	7.7%	28.0%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	36	25	15	32	30	19	59	2	218
		% within 7 point Party ID	21.6%	31.3%	29.4%	35.2%	23.8%	29.2%	30.1%	15.4%	27.6%
	Strongly disagree	Count	44	15	16	19	39	23	30	3	189
		% within 7 point Party ID	26.3%	18.8%	31.4%	20.9%	31.0%	35.4%	15.3%	23.1%	24.0%
	Don't know	Count	24	10	7	21	16	4	32	7	121
		% within 7 point Party ID	14.4%	12.5%	13.7%	23.1%	12.7%	6.2%	16.3%	53.8%	15.3%
Total		Count	167	80	51	91	126	65	196	13	789
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Share preferences * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	8	13	12	7	40
		% within age	6.2%	6.0%	3.7%	5.6%	5.0%
	Somewhat agree	Count	20	61	103	40	224
		% within age	15.4%	28.1%	31.5%	32.3%	28.1%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	40	59	86	35	220
		% within age	30.8%	27.2%	26.3%	28.2%	27.6%
	Strongly disagree	Count	34	47	81	28	190
		% within age	26.2%	21.7%	24.8%	22.6%	23.8%
	Don't know	Count	28	37	45	14	124
		% within age	21.5%	17.1%	13.8%	11.3%	15.5%
Total		Count	130	217	327	124	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * Education Crosstabulation

					Education)			
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	0	13	18	6	5	0	42
		% within Education	.0%	4.3%	7.5%	7.7%	4.7%	.0%	5.3%
	Somewhat agree	Count	7	93	55	25	35	9	224
		% within Education	21.9%	31.0%	23.0%	32.1%	32.7%	20.5%	28.0%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	11	78	61	22	32	16	220
		% within Education	34.4%	26.0%	25.5%	28.2%	29.9%	36.4%	27.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	6	61	71	15	25	13	191
		% within Education	18.8%	20.3%	29.7%	19.2%	23.4%	29.5%	23.9%
	Don't know	Count	8	55	34	10	10	6	123
		% within Education	25.0%	18.3%	14.2%	12.8%	9.3%	13.6%	15.4%
Total		Count	32	300	239	78	107	44	800
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a vear	Never	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	4	9	7	12	9	41
·		% within Religious attendance	2.9%	7.1%	7.9%	5.6%	3.9%	5.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	31	31	29	60	74	225
		% within Religious attendance	22.5%	24.6%	32.6%	27.9%	31.9%	28.1%
	Somewhat disagree Count	Count	51	31	29	51	58	220
		% within Religious attendance	37.0%	24.6%	32.6%	23.7%	25.0%	27.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	33	38	19	45	57	192
		% within Religious attendance	23.9%	30.2%	21.3%	20.9%	24.6%	24.0%
	Don't know	Count	19	17	5	47	34	122
		% within Religious attendance	13.8%	13.5%	5.6%	21.9%	14.7%	15.3%
Total		Count	138	126	89	215	232	800

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	4	9	7	12	9	41
		% within Religious attendance	2.9%	7.1%	7.9%	5.6%	3.9%	5.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	31	31	29	60	74	225
	Somewhat disagree	% within Religious attendance	22.5%	24.6%	32.6%	27.9%	31.9%	28.1%
S	Somewhat disagree	Count	51	31	29	51	58	220
		% within Religious attendance	37.0%	24.6%	32.6%	23.7%	25.0%	27.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	33	38	19	45	57	192
		% within Religious attendance	23.9%	30.2%	21.3%	20.9%	24.6%	24.0%
	Don't know	Count	19	17	5	47	34	122
		% within Religious attendance	13.8%	13.5%	5.6%	21.9%	14.7%	15.3%
Total		Count	138	126	89	215	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

Share preferences * Race Crosstabulation

-						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	18	9	12	2	0	0	0	41
-		% within Race	3.6%	9.4%	8.3%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	123	43	49	1	3	1	4	224
		% within Race	24.3%	44.8%	34.0%	10.0%	75.0%	6.7%	16.7%	28.0%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	143	20	34	3	1	8	11	220
		% within Race	28.2%	20.8%	23.6%	30.0%	25.0%	53.3%	45.8%	27.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	135	17	29	2	0	2	7	192
		% within Race	26.6%	17.7%	20.1%	20.0%	.0%	13.3%	29.2%	24.0%
	Don't know	Count	88	7	20	2	0	4	2	123
		% within Race	17.4%	7.3%	13.9%	20.0%	.0%	26.7%	8.3%	15.4%
Total		Count	507	96	144	10	4	15	24	800

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	18	9	12	2	0	0	0	41
		% within Race	3.6%	9.4%	8.3%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	123	43	49	1	3	1	4	224
		% within Race	24.3%	44.8%	34.0%	10.0%	75.0%	6.7%	16.7%	28.0%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	143	20	34	3	1	8	11	220
		% within Race	28.2%	20.8%	23.6%	30.0%	25.0%	53.3%	45.8%	27.5%
	Strongly disagree	Count	135	17	29	2	0	2	7	192
		% within Race	26.6%	17.7%	20.1%	20.0%	.0%	13.3%	29.2%	24.0%
	Don't know	Count	88	7	20	2	0	4	2	123
		% within Race	17.4%	7.3%	13.9%	20.0%	.0%	26.7%	8.3%	15.4%
Total		Count	507	96	144	10	4	15	24	800
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * Race Crosstabulation

Share preferences * Marital Status Crosstabulation

					Marit	tal Status			
			Marriad	Concreted	Divorand	Widowod	Cinalo	Domestic	Total
	-		Married	Separated	Divorced	widowed	Single	partnership	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	17	0	2	3	16	2	40
		% within Marital Status	3.7%	.0%	2.1%	8.6%	10.3%	4.9%	5.0%
	Somewhat agree	Count	125	4	34	13	33	15	224
		% within Marital Status	27.2%	33.3%	35.4%	37.1%	21.2%	36.6%	28.0%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	134	4	19	9	45	10	221
		% within Marital Status	29.2%	33.3%	19.8%	25.7%	28.8%	24.4%	27.7%
	Strongly disagree	Count	108	2	30	8	31	12	191
		% within Marital Status	23.5%	16.7%	31.3%	22.9%	19.9%	29.3%	23.9%
	Don't know	Count	75	2	11	2	31	2	123
		% within Marital Status	16.3%	16.7%	11.5%	5.7%	19.9%	4.9%	15.4%
Total		Count	459	12	96	35	156	41	799
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	20	21	41
		% within Gender	5.4%	4.9%	5.1%
	Somewhat agree	Count	113	111	224
		% within Gender	30.4%	25.9%	28.0%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	103	118	221
		% within Gender	27.7%	27.6%	27.6%
	Strongly disagree	Count	90	101	191
		% within Gender	24.2%	23.6%	23.9%
	Don't know	Count	46	77	123
		% within Gender	12.4%	18.0%	15.4%
Total		Count	372	428	800
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	14	17	10	41
		% within urban/suburban/rural	6.5%	4.3%	5.3%	5.2%
	Somewhat agree	Count	63	106	55	224
		% within urban/suburban/rural	29.4%	27.1%	28.9%	28.2%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	41	126	54	221
		% within urban/suburban/rural	19.2%	32.2%	28.4%	27.8%
	Strongly disagree	Count	57	95	35	187
		% within urban/suburban/rural	26.6%	24.3%	18.4%	23.5%
	Don't know	Count	39	47	36	122
		% within urban/suburban/rural	18.2%	12.0%	18.9%	15.3%
Total		Count	214	391	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share preferences * metro area Crosstabulation

•		
	metro area	Total

			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	
Share preferences	Strongly agree	Count	5	17	1	1	18	42
		% within metro area	3.2%	7.1%	1.5%	1.4%	6.7%	5.3%
	Somewhat agree	Count	49	61	20	23	67	220
		% within metro area	31.6%	25.5%	30.8%	32.9%	25.1%	27.6%
	Somewhat disagree	Count	44	63	15	22	77	221
		% within metro area	28.4%	26.4%	23.1%	31.4%	28.8%	27.8%
	Strongly disagree	Count	39	52	18	18	63	190
		% within metro area	25.2%	21.8%	27.7%	25.7%	23.6%	23.9%
	Don't know	Count	18	46	11	6	42	123
		% within metro area	11.6%	19.2%	16.9%	8.6%	15.7%	15.5%
Total		Count	155	239	65	70	267	796
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * libcon Crosstabulation

-						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	9	3	8	32	9	9	13	83
		% within libcon	19.6%	5.4%	13.6%	13.8%	8.1%	5.5%	10.4%	10.5%
	Somewhat important	Count	2	11	11	57	19	37	29	166
		% within libcon	4.3%	19.6%	18.6%	24.6%	17.1%	22.6%	23.2%	20.9%
	Not at all important	Count	29	36	38	109	79	110	80	481
		% within libcon	63.0%	64.3%	64.4%	47.0%	71.2%	67.1%	64.0%	60.7%
	Don't know	Count	6	6	2	34	4	8	3	63
		% within libcon	13.0%	10.7%	3.4%	14.7%	3.6%	4.9%	2.4%	7.9%
Total		Count	46	56	59	232	111	164	125	793
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

						7 point Pa	irty ID				
			Strong	Not very strong			Lean	Not very strong	Strong		
			Democrat	Democrat	Lean Democrat	Independent	Republican	Republican	Republican	Not sure	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	36	7	2	8	10	6	14	0	83
		% within 7 point Party ID	21.6%	8.8%	3.9%	8.7%	8.1%	9.1%	7.2%	.0%	10.6%
	Somewhat important	Count	32	28	9	14	17	16	47	2	165
		% within 7 point Party ID	19.2%	35.0%	17.6%	15.2%	13.7%	24.2%	24.2%	16.7%	21.0%

	Not at all important	Count	84	38	37	57	90	44	123	4	477
		% within 7 point Party ID	50.3%	47.5%	72.5%	62.0%	72.6%	66.7%	63.4%	33.3%	60.7%
	Don't know	Count	15	7	3	13	7	0	10	6	61
		% within 7 point Party ID	9.0%	8.8%	5.9%	14.1%	5.6%	.0%	5.2%	50.0%	7.8%
Total		Count	167	80	51	92	124	66	194	12	786
		% within 7 point Party ID	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Race ele	ctoral importance ^	age Crosstab	ulation			
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	14	28	32	9	83
		% within age	10.8%	12.9%	9.8%	7.3%	10.4%
	Somewhat important	Count	18	35	80	34	167
		% within age	13.8%	16.1%	24.5%	27.4%	20.9%
	Not at all important	Count	74	134	199	77	484
		% within age	56.9%	61.8%	60.9%	62.1%	60.7%
	Don't know	Count	24	20	16	4	64
		% within age	18.5%	9.2%	4.9%	3.2%	8.0%
Total		Count	130	217	327	124	798
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * age Crosstabulation

Race electoral importance * Education Crosstabulation

			Education						
				High school					
			No HS	graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	3	30	29	10	9	3	84
		% within Education	9.4%	10.0%	12.2%	13.0%	8.5%	6.8%	10.5%
	Somewhat important	Count	7	62	46	15	26	10	166
		% within Education	21.9%	20.6%	19.3%	19.5%	24.5%	22.7%	20.8%
	Not at all important	Count	16	177	150	50	66	26	485
		% within Education	50.0%	58.8%	63.0%	64.9%	62.3%	59.1%	60.8%
	Don't know	Count	6	32	13	2	5	5	63
		% within Education	18.8%	10.6%	5.5%	2.6%	4.7%	11.4%	7.9%
Total		Count	32	301	238	77	106	44	798
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Rel	igious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	17	11	10	26	21	85
		% within Religious attendance	12.4%	8.7%	11.2%	12.0%	9.1%	10.6%
	Somewhat important	Count	34	22	21	51	38	166
		% within Religious attendance	24.8%	17.5%	23.6%	23.6%	16.4%	20.8%
	Not at all important	Count	79	83	50	119	154	485
	_	% within Religious attendance	57.7%	65.9%	56.2%	55.1%	66.4%	60.6%
	Don't know	Count	7	10	8	20	19	64
		% within Religious attendance	5.1%	7.9%	9.0%	9.3%	8.2%	8.0%
Total		Count	137	126	89	216	232	800
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	18	29	28	2	2	1	3	83
		% within Race	3.6%	30.2%	19.6%	20.0%	50.0%	7.1%	13.0%	10.4%
1	Somewhat important	Count	85	26	40	4	0	3	7	165
		% within Race	16.8%	27.1%	28.0%	40.0%	.0%	21.4%	30.4%	20.7%
1	Not at all important	Count	369	38	53	4	2	8	12	486
1		% within Race	72.9%	39.6%	37.1%	40.0%	50.0%	57.1%	52.2%	61.1%
1	Don't know	Count	34	3	22	0	0	2	1	62
		% within Race	6.7%	3.1%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	4.3%	7.8%
Total		Count	506	96	143	10	4	14	23	796
1		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral important	ce * Marital Status	Crosstabulation
--------------------------	---------------------	-----------------

		Marital Status	Total						
--	--	----------------	-------						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	
---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	---------	-----------	----------	---------	--------	-------------------------	--------
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	34	3	8	7	27	4	83
		% within Marital Status	7.4%	23.1%	8.3%	20.6%	17.2%	10.3%	10.4%
	Somewhat important	Count	99	3	25	10	23	6	166
		% within Marital Status	21.7%	23.1%	26.0%	29.4%	14.6%	15.4%	20.9%
	Not at all important	Count	290	7	60	17	81	29	484
		% within Marital Status	63.5%	53.8%	62.5%	50.0%	51.6%	74.4%	60.8%
	Don't know	Count	34	0	3	0	26	0	63
		% within Marital Status	7.4%	.0%	3.1%	.0%	16.6%	.0%	7.9%
Total		Count	457	13	96	34	157	39	796
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	44	40	84
		% within Gender	11.8%	9.4%	10.5%
	Somewhat important	Count	74	93	167
		% within Gender	19.9%	21.8%	20.9%
	Not at all important	Count	235	250	485
		% within Gender	63.2%	58.5%	60.7%
	Don't know	Count	19	44	63
		% within Gender	5.1%	10.3%	7.9%
Total		Count	372	427	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ıral	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	30	39	16	85
		% within urban/suburban/rural	14.0%	10.0%	8.4%	10.7%
	Somewhat important	Count	52	70	45	167
		% within urban/suburban/rural	24.2%	17.9%	23.7%	21.0%
	Not at all important	Count	111	262	106	479
		% within urban/suburban/rural	51.6%	67.2%	55.8%	60.3%

	Don't know	Count	22	19	23	64
		% within urban/suburban/rural	10.2%	4.9%	12.1%	8.1%
Total		Count	215	390	190	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Race electoral importance * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in the Houston area.	Yes, I live the Dallas-Fort Worth area	Yes, I live in the San Antonio area	Yes, I live in the Austin area	No, I live in another part of Texas.	Total
Race electoral importance	Very important	Count	14	32	6	3	30	85
		% within metro area	9.0%	13.4%	9.4%	4.3%	11.2%	10.7%
	Somewhat important	Count	35	37	14	17	63	166
		% within metro area	22.4%	15.5%	21.9%	24.3%	23.5%	20.8%
	Not at all important	Count	100	145	35	47	154	481
		% within metro area	64.1%	60.7%	54.7%	67.1%	57.5%	60.4%
	Don't know	Count	7	25	9	3	21	65
		% within metro area	4.5%	10.5%	14.1%	4.3%	7.8%	8.2%
Total		Count	156	239	64	70	268	797
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * libcon Crosstabula	tion
--	------

						libcon				
			Extremely liberal1	2	3	In the middle4	5	6	Extremely conservative7	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	12	9	10	31	22	42	39	165
		% within libcon	26.7%	15.8%	16.9%	13.5%	19.6%	25.6%	31.0%	20.8%
	Somewhat likely	Count	13	24	17	69	48	63	59	293
		% within libcon	28.9%	42.1%	28.8%	30.1%	42.9%	38.4%	46.8%	37.0%
	Not at all likely	Count	20	22	29	91	30	51	26	269
		% within libcon	44.4%	38.6%	49.2%	39.7%	26.8%	31.1%	20.6%	34.0%
	Don't know	Count	0	2	3	38	12	8	2	65
		% within libcon	.0%	3.5%	5.1%	16.6%	10.7%	4.9%	1.6%	8.2%
Total		Count	45	57	59	229	112	164	126	792
		% within libcon	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

7 point Party ID Not very Not very Strong strong Lean Lean strong Strong Democrat Democrat Democrat Independent Republican Republican Republican Not sure Total Likely to contact Very likely Count 32 5 13 20 40 11 43 2 166 19.0% 21.5% 32.0% 21.9% 21.0% % within 7 point Party ID 6.3% 25.5% 16.7% 15.4% 50 27 29 53 32 295 Somewhat likely Count 19 83 2 % within 7 point Party ID 29.8% 33.8% 37.3% 31.2% 42.4% 48.5% 42.3% 15.4% 37.2% Not at all likely Count 67 42 18 33 28 17 59 267 3 52.5% % within 7 point Party ID 39.9% 35.3% 35.5% 22.4% 25.8% 30.1% 23.1% 33.7% Don't know Count 19 6 1 11 4 6 11 6 64 % within 7 point Party ID 11.3% 2.0% 11.8% 3.2% 9.1% 5.6% 46.2% 8.1% 7.5% Total Count 168 80 51 93 125 66 196 13 792 100.0% 100.0% % within 7 point Party ID 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

Likely to contact * 7 point Party ID Crosstabulation

Likely to contact * age Crosstabulation

				a	ge		
			18-29	30-44	45-64	65 & over	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	16	45	71	33	165
		% within age	12.3%	20.7%	21.7%	26.4%	20.7%
	Somewhat likely	Count	35	76	135	48	294
		% within age	26.9%	35.0%	41.3%	38.4%	36.8%
	Not at all likely	Count	58	74	100	43	275
		% within age	44.6%	34.1%	30.6%	34.4%	34.4%
	Don't know	Count	21	22	21	1	65
		% within age	16.2%	10.1%	6.4%	.8%	8.1%
Total		Count	130	217	327	125	799
		% within age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * Education Crosstabulation

					Education				
			No HS	High school graduate	Some college	2-year	4-year	Post-grad	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	4	45	65	23	21	8	166
		% within Education	12.1%	15.0%	27.1%	29.5%	19.6%	18.2%	20.7%
	Somewhat likely	Count	18	96	79	35	46	21	295
		% within Education	54.5%	32.0%	32.9%	44.9%	43.0%	47.7%	36.8%

	Not at all likely	Count	11	117	78	19	36	14	275
		% within Education	33.3%	39.0%	32.5%	24.4%	33.6%	31.8%	34.3%
	Don't know	Count	0	42	18	1	4	1	66
		% within Education	.0%	14.0%	7.5%	1.3%	3.7%	2.3%	8.2%
Total		Count	33	300	240	78	107	44	802
		% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * Religious attendance Crosstabulation

				Reli	gious attendance			
			More than once a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once or twice a year	Never	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	32	30	15	42	46	165
		% within Religious attendance	23.2%	23.8%	17.0%	19.4%	19.9%	20.7%
	Somewhat likely	Count	63	56	31	79	65	294
		% within Religious attendance	45.7%	44.4%	35.2%	36.6%	28.1%	36.8%
	Not at all likely	Count	36	33	35	72	98	274
		% within Religious attendance	26.1%	26.2%	39.8%	33.3%	42.4%	34.3%
	Don't know	Count	7	7	7	23	22	66
		% within Religious attendance	5.1%	5.6%	8.0%	10.6%	9.5%	8.3%
Total		Count	138	126	88	216	231	799
		% within Religious attendance	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * Race Crosstabulation

						Race				
			White / Blanco	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American / Americano indÃ-gena Ã ³ nativo	Mixed	Other	Total
	-	-	White / Dianeo	Diacit	Thopartic	7131011	nativo	WINCU	Ounor	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	114	16	19	1	3	2	9	164
		% within Race	22.5%	16.5%	13.3%	11.1%	75.0%	13.3%	39.1%	20.6%
	Somewhat likely	Count	196	41	39	5	1	5	6	293

		% within Race	38.7%	42.3%	27.3%	55.6%	25.0%	33.3%	26.1%	36.8%
	Not at all likely	Count	159	28	73	2	0	6	6	274
		% within Race	31.4%	28.9%	51.0%	22.2%	.0%	40.0%	26.1%	34.4%
	Don't know	Count	37	12	12	1	0	2	2	66
		% within Race	7.3%	12.4%	8.4%	11.1%	.0%	13.3%	8.7%	8.3%
Total		Count	506	97	143	9	4	15	23	797
		% within Race	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * Marital Status Crosstabulation

				Marital Status						
			Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Single	Domestic partnership	Total	
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	101	4	20	9	21	10	165	
		% within Marital Status	22.0%	30.8%	20.8%	25.0%	13.5%	25.0%	20.6%	
	Somewhat likely	Count	171	5	35	14	55	15	295	
		% within Marital Status	37.3%	38.5%	36.5%	38.9%	35.3%	37.5%	36.9%	
	Not at all likely	Count	154	4	33	13	56	14	274	
		% within Marital Status	33.6%	30.8%	34.4%	36.1%	35.9%	35.0%	34.3%	
	Don't know	Count	33	0	8	0	24	1	66	
		% within Marital Status	7.2%	.0%	8.3%	.0%	15.4%	2.5%	8.3%	
Total		Count	459	13	96	36	156	40	800	
		% within Marital Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Likely to contact * Gender Crosstabulation

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	80	85	165
		% within Gender	21.6%	19.9%	20.7%
	Somewhat likely	Count	149	145	294
		% within Gender	40.2%	33.9%	36.8%
	Not at all likely	Count	120	154	274
		% within Gender	32.3%	36.0%	34.3%
	Don't know	Count	22	44	66
		% within Gender	5.9%	10.3%	8.3%
Total		Count	371	428	799

			Ger	nder	
			Male	Female	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	80	85	165
		% within Gender	21.6%	19.9%	20.7%
	Somewhat likely	Count	149	145	294
		% within Gender	40.2%	33.9%	36.8%
	Not at all likely	Count	120	154	274
		% within Gender	32.3%	36.0%	34.3%
	Don't know	Count	22	44	66
		% within Gender	5.9%	10.3%	8.3%
Total		Count	371	428	799
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * Gender Crosstabulation

Likely to contact * urban/suburban/rural Crosstabulation

			urb	an/suburban/ru	ural	
			Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	40	76	49	165
		% within urban/suburban/rural	18.7%	19.5%	25.7%	20.8%
	Somewhat likely	Count	70	157	67	294
		% within urban/suburban/rural	32.7%	40.3%	35.1%	37.0%
	Not at all likely	Count	78	130	62	270
		% within urban/suburban/rural	36.4%	33.3%	32.5%	34.0%
	Don't know	Count	26	27	13	66
		% within urban/suburban/rural	12.1%	6.9%	6.8%	8.3%
Total		Count	214	390	191	795
		% within urban/suburban/rural	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Likely to contact * metro area Crosstabulation

					metro area			
			Yes, I live in	Yes, I live the	Yes, I live in		No, I live in	, I
			the Houston	Dallas-Fort	the San	Yes, I live in	another part of	
			area.	Worth area	Antonio area	the Austin area	Texas.	Total
Likely to contact	Very likely	Count	42	37	13	10	62	164
		% within metro area	27.1%	15.5%	20.6%	14.3%	23.2%	20.7%
	Somewhat likely	Count	61	102	20	25	86	294

		% within metro area	39.4%	42.7%	31.7%	35.7%	32.2%	37.0%
	Not at all likely	Count	36	86	24	30	98	274
		% within metro area	23.2%	36.0%	38.1%	42.9%	36.7%	34.5%
	Don't know	Count	16	14	6	5	21	62
		% within metro area	10.3%	5.9%	9.5%	7.1%	7.9%	7.8%
Total		Count	155	239	63	70	267	794
		% within metro area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%